THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

The intellectual revival of the Evangelical Movement in our time, witnessed by the publication of volumes of St. Paul's Library, some of which have been reviewed in this magazine lately, is marked notably by a reaction against the religious individualism of the nineteenth century Evangelical Party and a new sense of the importance of the Church in Christian life. This is illustrated in an extremely able statement made in the most recent addition to the St. Paul's Library, *The Church of God*,[1] by the Rev. F. John Taylor, M.A., Vicar of Christ's Church, Claughton.

There is one indisputably new feature which has marked much thinking in Europe in the last hundred years, says Mr. Taylor—the attempt to separate Christian conduct from Christian faith. And this has given birth to another futile supposition, that Christianity can survive in individuals without the functioning of the Christian community. Earlier ages, though they might criticize the moral failure or the spiritual blindness of the Church, took it for granted as the necessary form of Christian existence in the world.

To-day we are confronted by masses of people who are still believers to the extent that they retain a garbled form of Christian faith which amounts to little more than a somewhat vague conviction of the beneficent operations of an inscrutable Providence, but who steadily refuse any effective connexion with the visible Christian fellowship in their neighbourhood. It is true they like to feel that the Church is 'there,' both for their own convenience and because it does exercise some influence for good. But that is all. They keep aloof from the Church, and thereby demonstrate not only their profound misunderstanding of the gospel but also the seeming irrelevance of the modern Church and its gospel to their life.

There are others whose attitude to the Church is not a benevolent neutrality but an active hostility, without necessarily reckoning themselves opposed to Christianity. To them the long record of the Church in history seems to be little better than an apostasy from the teaching and example of the Lord. As a social factor in history the Church has often tolerated economic oppression, supported social injustice and resisted intellectual development, so that the simplicity and glory of the essential Christian message has been distorted and, at times, obscured by the very body which is supposed to maintain essential Christianity. The Church then appears not part of the gospel but its scandal.

This modern tendency to separate Christianity from the Church is not unconnected with the far-reaching social changes in the established pattern of society inaugurated by the Industrial Revolution and now approaching their climax in the new mass-society of industrial man. Formerly the parish was no mere ecclesiastical unit but the effective framework of daily life. The cohesion of natural groupings in family, neighbourhood, and village found its inevitable expression in the parish, and the parish church was the visible symbol of that Christian togetherness which informed the whole.

To-day industrial development has replaced villages and compact small towns by great factories, big business and sprawling ill-disciplined towns where thousands of people are huddled together in a physical proximity which has destroyed any true community. Speedy transport and wireless communication have turned the whole world into a neighbourhood, and rendered more difficult the task of living together as neighbours.

These tremendous changes in the social structure of life have not only thrust an unparalleled crisis upon the Church in the world, but have also given rise to a number of desperate attempts to manu-

[1] Canterbury Press; 6s. net.

facture a religion with sufficient social dynamic to overcome those powerful forces of disintegration in modern society which have gone far to destroy man and turn him into a mechanical function. This is the secret of the attraction of Nazism and of Marxist Russia which seems to satisfy the craving among the masses to be delivered from the terrifying isolation of industrial society. But the Collectivist State does something different. It reduces the individual to a unit in the herd, a number in the State. And the result sometimes is a revolution which is a blind search after that true community in which a man can find his true personality in personal relationships with his neighbours.

This sociality of human nature is a truth of the order of creation, recognized by many non-Christian thinkers and declared in the Biblical account of creation (' it is not good that the man should be alone '). It is therefore one of the facts with which grace must reckon in the order of redemption. It is man with this fundamental structure of personality, involving a status in society, who is to be redeemed. It is for this reason that we are learning to-day to put a fresh emphasis on the Body of Christ as an integral part of the gospel of Christ, and not because individualism has been discredited in the modern collectivist world. Redemption involves the restoration of that community which was part of God's creative will.

The same act which reconciles a man to God also puts him in the company of the redeemed, there to share in a common life. The part played by the Christian community, which precedes him in time, in the conversion of a man is of supreme importance. There is no other way by which anyone can become a Christian, for it is thus a man receives the knowledge of those saving acts in which God comes to us. This truth was one to which John Wesley firmly adhered in his evangelistic work. And he took immense pains to order the life of his converts in the living fellowship of the class meeting. Behind all his preaching was the eloquent testimony of a rediscovered corporate Christian life.

This was regarded coldly by the official Church, with the result that evangelicalism has inherited a legacy of suspicion of churchliness as a hindrance to the proclamation of the gospel. This suspicion was deepened by the course of events in the nineteenth century when in society at large the virtues of a sturdy individualism were applauded. The task of evangelism was often undertaken in isolation from the normal family life of the Church. The dangers of ' churchianity ' becoming a substitute for the direct and living knowledge of Christ were so apparent that the essential truth that no man could become a Christian without in the same moment being put into a vital relationship with all other Christians was largely obscured. Redemption from sin is the re-integration of life around a new centre. That centre is Christ, but a Christ who never can be separated from His redeemed people.

The pressure of persecution, the growing paganism of our time and that profound need of true community of which modern man is acutely aware, together with the theological revival in the Reformed Churches which has been in progress since 1918, all these factors have been leading Christians to rediscover the truth, embodied in both Testaments, of the supremely important part played by the people of God in the fulfilment of the divine purpose. Further, contemporary Christian history has demonstrated in concrete happenings the truth of the Biblical witness by its wide expansion in the mission field.

The combination of these two forces, theological revival and contemporary historic circumstances, has made thinking about the Church a matter of vital concern to Christians at the present time. ' The topic of " the Church " now bids fair to play in the intellectual history of Christendom in our twentieth century that dominant part which the topic of the Incarnation played in the fourth and fifth centuries. And this restored apprehension of the Church as the Body of Christ is arising in, or rather out of, a situation in which the intense eschatological interest of the Apostolic Age is once more becoming vivid in Christian minds.' These words, quoted from Dom Gregory Dix, close Mr. TAYLOR'S introduction to a book which, scriptural and theological, attempts to estimate the meaning of the Church of God.

The William Ainslie Memorial Lecture was delivered last year by Professor C. H. DODD, D.D., F.B.A.—*The Gospel and the Law of Christ.*[1] With masterly ease the lecturer brings together and balances over against each other the Gospel and the Law of Christ ; that is, the Christian revelation and the Christian ethic, the story of what God has done through Christ and its proper sequel in what man should do in Christ's name and for His sake.

[1] Longmans ; 1s. 6d. net.

How is the Law of Christ related to the Gospel of Christ? First, God's revelation of Himself to men is represented in the Bible in the form of a *covenant* between God and man; and the pattern of the covenant consists, on the one hand, of a declaration of the divine action through which the covenant was initiated, and, on the other hand, of the corresponding obligation which man undertakes. In the Old Testament the obligation, as set forth in the Decalogue, is to Him who brought Israel up out of the land of Egypt. In the New Testament the obligation, as set forth in the New Commandment, is to Him who so loved the world that He gave His Son; the covenant is 'in the blood of Christ.'

'Gospel and Commandment are two sides, or aspects, of a single reality, or rather activity, which is *agape*, the love of God, the divine charity; and *agape* in action is the glory of God revealed, whether it be His own redemptive act in Christ, or the simplest act of charity which His lowliest creature is enabled by His grace to perform; since of any such act it must be said, "We love, because He first loved us."'

Secondly, what light does this relation between Gospel and Law throw upon the nature and range of Christian obligation? We must not think that Christian obligation is simply to be stated as obedience to the single principle of *agape*. Our Lord's own precepts, apart from those of His apostles, are not merely particular often in quality and direction but embarrassingly so. To adduce a single instance, 'If anyone strikes you on one cheek, turn the other cheek.' Difficult as it may be to take such a precept literally, it must be taken seriously, and not merely characterized as paradoxical or hyperbolical.

But let us quote the lecturer's admirable exposition of this precept, 'Turn the other cheek.' He does not regard the precept as showing how the demands of God may be absolutely fulfilled; God's demands are as infinite as His love. But he regards it as indicating, in vivid and arresting fashion, the quality and the direction of any action which is to conform to the love of God. 'This quality may be present, in its degree, at quite a lowly level of performance, and the right direction may be clearly discernible in the act even though the goal is still far off.'

Here is the exposition of the meaning of the injunction to 'turn the other cheek': 'It is hardly possible to treat that as a ruling to be directly applied in all appropriate circumstances. It is not only that we may not be good enough to put it into practice. It may not, in the confused and distorted state of human affairs, be always the best thing to do. On the other hand, it can hardly be regarded as the ideal for conduct in an ideally perfect society. In such a society the contingency would not arise. But the picture which Jesus draws sets before us vividly, in the context of an imperfect society, the patience, the detachment from egoism and pride, and the respect for other people, even the most objectionable, which we can clearly see to conform to God's action towards us in Christ. We are to imitate, in our measure, His forbearance under affronts, His respect for our freedom which will not allow Him to coerce, and His endless patience. And these qualities must give character to Christian action even at a lowly level; even if all we can manage is a half-frustrated effort to overcome, or at least to moderate, our natural pride, resentment, and impatience for Christ's sake. In making that effort, we have obeyed the command of Christ, since the very effort has in it the quality, and moves in the direction, which He prescribes; while every such effort will help us to realize afresh the immense distance that still separates us from perfect fulfilment of His Law.'

That the precepts of Christ are not statutory definitions like those of the Mosaic Code, but indications—to repeat the phrase—of quality and direction of action, Dr. DODD regards as a very important point when we consider the application of Christian moral standards to society at large. 'It may be neither possible nor desirable for nations to act like the man who turns the other cheek, but even at such a moment as this in the affairs of the world, human action is wrong, unless it partakes of this quality, of a patient and unself-regarding respect for the other party, however objectionable; and aims in this direction, towards "overcoming evil with good." Unless it does so, it is not only wrong, but ultimately disastrous.'

At the close of the Lecture there are some illuminating references to the relation between the Law of Christ and 'natural law' or 'the law of Nature,' on which latter subject much has been recently written. Dr. DODD refers to man's conscience as a kind of palimpsest, in which may be deciphered here and there, despite the perversity of the human will and the depravity of human society, some words of the original script that God had written on it; and when they are deciphered, they are found to be 'a first draft of that revelation of the will of God which is given to us clear and fresh in Christ.'

The Unity of the New Testament.

The Doctrine of Christ.[1]

By the Right Reverend A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D., Bishop of Derby.

The New Testament is rooted in the conviction that in Jesus Christ God has decisively acted for the deliverance of His creation from thraldom to sin, evil, and death. The New Testament did not create or give rise to this faith—it is not itself the foundation. 'Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.'[2] The New Testament presupposes the faith as already existing, the foundation as having already been laid. There is a Gospel—a Divine message of Good News—in the world, to which all its writers bear witness; and the Divine message of Good News is the proclamation of what God has wrought in and through Jesus the Christ, who is the 'Yea' and the 'Amen' in whom the Divine promises find their fulfilment,[3] and whose coming into the world of time and of history means that already the Era of Final Redemption has dawned

In modern times there has been a tendency to try to do without any 'doctrine of Christ,' and to look upon Jesus as having been simply a Teacher. In the Gospels He is *the* Teacher, the Messiah, who as such speaks with authority. He is not to be set in a line, or in series, with others. The revelation which through Him has come to mankind is in principle final. We are not to 'look for another.'[4] He is the Chosen of God, the Anointed, the son of David, the Son of God. In Him the 'ultimate' has entered history. God has in Him 'visited and redeemed his people.'[5] It is already the 'last hour,'[6] for the 'powers of the Coming Age'[7] are already at work. We cannot hope to understand Jesus in abstraction from this New Testament interpretation of Him, or to set forth His 'Good News' of the 'Kingdom' in isolation from its context in contemporary Judaism, and from those Old Testament Scriptures of which the New Testament from end to end claims to be the fulfilment and consummation. The first presupposition of a true understanding of Christianity must be a living faith in the living God and in His over-ruling and lordship of history, His activity in and through history, His selection of Israel to be in a peculiar sense the people of His choice, His world-purposes of renewal and of salvation (no less than of judgment), which already in Christ begin to be fulfilled, and which through Christ are to find final fulfilment. The setting of the Gospel is from first to last 'eschatological.'

The word 'eschatological' means 'having to do with the last things.' Late Jewish thought distinguished 'this age' from the 'age to come'; and the note of the 'age to come' was finality. God would one day bring to an end this present 'age,' in which evil powers were at work, and, gaining decisive victory over them, would inaugurate the final 'age,' which should endure to eternity, and into which nothing that is evil should ever find entrance. That would be the era of God's unchallenged and all-conquering sovereignty; and of His Kingdom, thus finally established, there should be no end. The Gospel proclaims the Divine Kingdom as being already at hand. Already the *eschaton* confronts men: the decisive call, the final choice between evil and good, comes to them *now*: with the utmost urgency they are called upon to repent, and to believe the Good News.[8]

Nay, in a most real sense, where Jesus was, there was already the Kingdom—as it were by anticipation. It has come suddenly upon men, taking them unawares;[9] it is already in their midst.[10] It is being manifested in the Lord's 'mighty works' of Divine power, and especially in the casting out of the 'demons,' whereby the power of Satan is overthrown. The Lord is not only the Herald, He is also the Bringer, of final salvation. He stands in the midst of Galilee, and summons men to Himself;[11] but He hurries on to Jerusalem, where He must die.[12] That the Messiah should be put to death (and such a death!) was for Judaism an unbelievable paradox. The

[1] In this article the writer has in effect summarized (with occasional unacknowledged quotations from, or verbal echoes of, what he had there written) the arguments more fully set forth in his two books *Christ in the Gospels* (Oxford University Press, 1944) and *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ* (Longmans, Green & Co., 1926). The latter work is no longer obtainable, the publishers' stocks having been destroyed in the War by 'enemy action.'

[2] 1 Co 3^{11}. [3] 2 Co 1^{20}. [4] Mt 11^{3}.
[5] Lk 1^{68}. [6] 1 Jn 2^{18}. [7] He 6^{5}.
[8] Mk 1^{15}. [9] Mt 12^{28}, Lk 11^{20}.
[10] Lk 17^{21}. The rendering 'within you' is difficult. Would our Lord have described the Kingdom as being 'within' the Pharisees? The original Aramaic wording of the saying is, of course, irrecoverable.
[11] Mt 11^{28}.
[12] Mk 10^{32}, Mt 16^{21} 20^{18}, Lk $9^{31.51-53}$ 13^{33} 19^{28}.

Gospels make it clear that it was the conviction of Jesus that so it must be.[1] It was by the road of humiliation, suffering, and death that the Christ must pass to His Kingdom and glory. Already at the Last Supper He had dedicated Himself to a redemptive and sacrificial death on behalf of the people of God.[2] But His Cross must be understood in the light of His Resurrection, whereby God had triumphantly vindicated His Christ (reversing the judgment of men), and in virtue of which Jesus was 'declared to be the Son of God with power.'[3] The Gospels suggest that the Lord had Himself looked beyond suffering and death to being seated at God's 'right hand' and to 'coming with the clouds of heaven.'[4] It was the conviction of the earliest Christianity that God would 'judge the world in righteousness by the man whom he' had 'ordained.'[5] In the meantime repentance unto the remission of sins was proclaimed in His name.[6]

Earlier in date than the Gospels, and independent of them, are the Epistles of St. Paul. For St. Paul Jesus is the Son of God, the Redeemer, the Lord. The former persecutor of those who followed the new 'Way' had become, as the result of what happened on the Damascus road, the bondservant or 'slave' of Jesus Christ.[7] Twelve years after his conversion he took part in a mission organized from Antioch,[8] in the course of which it became clear that his special vocation and sphere was to be that of a preacher of Christ to the Gentiles.[9] His theology, as set forth in his extant Epistles, bears the stamp of his individual mind, though he makes it clear that it was in substance approved and endorsed by the original 'pillars' of the Church at Jerusalem.[10] St. Paul's Christ is in fact the Christ of the Church, identified by him, as by Christians generally, with Jesus of Nazareth, but regarded now as the exalted Lord of the present and future. It is probable that at the time of his conversion he had seen a vision of the Jesus whom (in the persons of His followers) he was persecuting surrounded and accompanied by a radiance of white light,[11] suggestive of 'glory'—the 'glory' of God. At the original Creation God had 'commanded the light to shine out of darkness'[12]: in Christ there was a 'new creation,'[13] and God had 'shined' in men's hearts, 'to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.'[14]

For a reader of the Old Testament the word 'glory' was rich in religious associations. It denoted the Divine splendour and majesty: it suggested also the moral and spiritual 'glory' of God. In a passage in the Book of Numbers, where the Hebrew text has a word meaning 'form,' the authors of the Septuagint version substituted the Greek word commonly used by them to translate the word which means 'glory.'[15] For St. Paul the 'form,' 'image' and 'glory' of God are all closely associated: nor can he forget that in the Book of Genesis man had been described as being made in the Divine 'image.'[16] For him Jesus, the Lord whom he had seen manifested in 'glory' on the road to Damascus, is the 'Man' from heaven,[17] God's 'own Son,'[18] the true 'image' of God,[19] and the 'firstborn of all creation,'[20] who, in the 'form' of God pre-existent from all eternity, had deliberately assumed the 'form' of a 'slave' or 'servant' of God, in order to die by 'the death of the cross' for man's redemption.[21] The first man, Adam, according to the story in Genesis had succumbed to the Serpent's temptation, seeking to make himself equal with God.[22] The second Adam did *not* 'count equality with God a prize at which to snatch,' but had 'made himself of no account'; and, *because* of His lowly obedience and submission to death, God had 'highly exalted him,' and had bestowed on him 'the name that is above every name'—the Divine title of 'Lord'—so that it is in fact by means of a worship in which Jesus is invoked by that title that the prophecy of Isaiah is to be fulfilled,[23] and the whole universe brought to acknowledge the one God of the Old Testament Scriptures, not to the prejudice of monotheism, but 'to the glory of God the Father.'[24] It is obvious that St. Paul's teaching prepares the way for the later Church doctrine of the co-eternity and consubstantiality of the Son with the Father. He arrives at his conclusion along rabbinic and Biblical lines; but he succeeds on the one hand in doing justice to the Gospel of man's redemption through Christ, and on the other in combining

[1] Mk 10^{45} 14^{49}, Mt $26^{54, 56}$.
[2] Mk 14^{24} and parallels, 1 Co 11^{25}.
[3] Ro 1^{4}. [4] Mk 14^{62} and parallels.
[5] Ac 17^{31} 10^{42}. [6] Ac 2^{33} 10^{43} 13^{38}.
[7] Ro 1^{1}; cf. Gal 1^{10}, Ph 1^{1}.
[8] The date of the events described in Ac 13 may be taken as A.D. 47 or 48; St. Paul's conversion may be dated about A.D. 35 or 36.
[9] Ac $13^{46ff.}$. In Gal $1^{15ff.}$ St. Paul regards his special 'call' to the Gentile mission as having been already involved in the Divine purposes from the time of his vocation.
[10] Gal 2^{2-10}. Such divergences as arose between St. Paul and the leaders of the original Church concerned not the essentials of faith and redemption through Christ, but the question of the relation of Gentile converts to Christianity to the Old Testament 'law,' an issue which was in the end satisfactorily settled in the interests of Gentile freedom (Ac 15^{1-30}; cf. Gal $2^{11ff.}$).
[11] Ac 9^{3} 22^{6} 26^{13}. [12] 2 Co 4^{6}; cf. Gn 1^{3}.
[13] 2 Co 5^{17}. [14] 2 Co 4^{6}. [15] Nu 12^{8}.
[16] Gn 1^{27}. [17] 1 Co 15^{47}.
[18] Ro $8^{3, 32}$; cf. Gal 4^{4}, 2 Co 1^{19}.
[19] 2 Co 4^{4}, Col 1^{15}. [20] Col 1^{15}.
[21] Ph 2^{6}. [22] Gn 3^{5}. [23] Is 45^{23}.
[24] Ph 2^{5-11}.

the vindication of the Christian worship of Jesus as Lord with a firm insistence on monotheism. In Jesus, as the 'Son of God's love,' dwells all the 'fulness' of Godhead in concrete actuality: [1] in and through Him, as God's 'image' and 'first-born,' were all things created: in Him all things consist, and in Him they are destined to be 'summed up.' [2]

Fundamentally, for St. Paul as for the later thinkers of the Church, the conviction that Jesus is Divine rests on the conviction that, in and through Him, God has wrought a Divine work. For him the paradox of a crucified Messiah, once accepted, is the supreme miracle of the Divine love. 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself' [3]—at that cost. The most accursed and unholy of deaths had become the holiest of offerings—the sacrificial self-giving of the Son of God's love for the redemption of sinners. 'There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.' [4] Christ has died for us: [5] expiation has been made—Christ has been 'set forth' as a 'propitiation.' [6] In Him 'we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins.' [7] 'He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not also with him freely give us all things?' [8] The doctrine of the Atonement is a doctrine difficult to rationalize, and it has sometimes been expounded and rationalized in unfortunate ways; but it lies at the heart of the Gospel.

Interpreted in terms of the conceptions of priesthood and sacrifice, it is further set forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews. In St. Paul's teaching the Old Testament 'law,' considered as a code of injunctions and precepts regulating the moral conduct of men in relation to God, is at once fulfilled and superseded by the new righteousness of God, made available through Christ. In the Epistle to the Hebrews the Old Testament law of sacrifice is in parallel fashion exhibited as being fulfilled once for all in the self-offering of Christ, the High Priest of a new and 'better' Covenant. [9] The sacrifices of the Old Testament had been only of typical significance—they had not been ultimately real or efficacious. Ps 40 had already pointed the way to a more adequate doctrine: the true inward meaning of sacrifice is to be found not in the last resort in the merely literal outpouring of blood (true though it be that 'apart from shedding of blood there is no remission'), [10] but in the offering of a deliberately dedicated and consecrated will. [11] The essence of the doctrine of sacrifice, as the author of Hebrews expounds it, is that Christ's life of flawless obedience, consummated in death, and utterly consecrated to God on behalf of His brethren, is the means whereby man is made one with God and God with man: and that it is on the ground of that sacrifice, once perfectly offered in time, but eternal in its significance (for the great 'high priest . . . after the order of Melchizedek' [12] ever 'liveth to make intercession' for sinners), [13] that those who are in Christ can with confident boldness 'draw near' and approach God in their worship. [14] The sphere of the true and eternal worship of God is not upon earth, but in heaven, where is 'the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, not man.' [15] Into that eternal sphere the worship of Christians on earth is lifted up; and there they have 'an altar,' whereof those whose conception of sacrifice stops short at the 'tabernacle' of Judaism have 'no right to eat.' [16] For the writer of Hebrews, as for St. Paul, Christ is the 'express image' of God's 'being' and the 'effulgence' of His 'glory.' [17] But He is also the Son of God who as 'son of man' has been made 'lower than the angels,' [18] who took 'hold of the seed of Abraham' and was 'in all things to be made like unto his brethren,' [19] and who on the ground of His suffering of death has been 'crowned with glory and honour,' in order that by God's grace His tasting of death might be on every man's behalf. [20]

Of interest because of the riot of its imagery is the Apocalypse of St. John, which sets forth Jesus as the exalted and regnant Redeemer, alive for evermore, and having the keys of death and of Hades. [21] If (as is probable) the book is earlier in date than the Fourth Gospel, it is the first Christian writing to identify Christ with the Divine 'Word,' though for the writer of the Apocalypse the 'Word of God' is conceived in the spirit of a passage in the Book of Wisdom [22] as a Divine Warrior who 'in righteousness doth judge and make war.' [23] The title 'Lamb,' too (which occurs twenty-nine times in the course of the book), is in some passages used (as in Jewish apocalypses) to denote the Messiah who can fight as a warrior and who can manifest 'wrath,' [24] though it denotes elsewhere the Lamb slain for the redemption of sinners. [25] 'The Lamb who conquers,' wrote the late Dr. R. H. Charles, 'is the Lamb who has given Himself up as a willing sacrifice. But the principle of love going forth in sacrifice is older

[1] Col 2^9. So I would paraphrase the word translated 'bodily.'
[2] Col $1^{13ff.}$, Eph 1^{10}. [3] 2 Co 5^{19}. [4] Ro 8^1.
[5] Ro 5^6. [6] Ro 3^{25}. [7] Col 1^{14}. [8] Ro 8^{32}.
[9] He 8^6. [10] He 9^{22}. [11] He $10^{4ff.}$; cf. Ps 40^{6-8}.
[12] He 6^{20}; cf. Ps 110^4, Gn $14^{18ff.}$.
[13] He 7^{25}. [14] He $10^{19ff.}$.
[15] He 8^2. [16] He 13^{10}.
[17] He 1^3. [18] He $2^{6ff.}$.
[19] He $2^{16ff.}$. [20] He 2^9.
[21] Rev 1^{18}. [22] Wis $18^{15ff.}$.
[23] Rev $19^{11ff.}$. [24] Rev 17^{14} 6^{16}.
[25] Rev 13^8 5^{12}.

than the world—the Lamb was slain from its foundation.' [1]

The culmination and crown of the whole New Testament is the Gospel according to St. John, the maturest expression of the reflective mind of the first generation of Christians, the Gospel moreover in which the theology implicit in the earlier tradition is made fully explicit and ascribed to the Saviour Himself, who in this Gospel is represented as reflecting upon the mystery of His own Person and as proclaiming Himself in the first person singular. 'Before Abraham was,' He says, 'I am.' [2] The Evangelist identifies Jesus with the creative, personified Word, the self-utterance, of God. In Him the 'Word' has become 'flesh.' [3] God has in Jesus uttered Himself in manhood, once and for all. In the core of His being, our Lord is Divine. He is not only the Son of God: He is God the Son—yet in subordination to the Father.[4] He came down from heaven, and to heaven He returns.[5] He is the Way, the Truth and the Life,[6] 'sent' by the Father [7] to be the Saviour of the world,[8] the Lamb of God, who takes away the world's sin.[9] He is a proper object of worship—to refuse to 'honour' the Son with the same 'honour' as is given to God is to refuse to 'honour the Father which sent him.' [10] To see the Son is to see the Father,[11] and to know the Son is to know the Father also.[12] He is the Source and the Giver of life eternal,[13] the true Bread from heaven, giving life to the world.[14] He is the Light which shines in the world's darkness and is not overwhelmed by the darkness, so that men need no longer 'abide' in the darkness, but may have the 'light of life' and be 'sons of light.' [15]

Yet, with all this, it is as true of the Fourth Gospel as it is of the three earlier Gospels both that it insists on the concrete reality of our Lord's manhood, and that it culminates in the Passion and Resurrection. The Lord sits weary by the well,[16] weeps by the grave of His friend,[17] is troubled in soul,[18] is distressed by the treachery of His false disciple,[19] and thirsts on the Cross.[20] His 'meat' is to do the will of Him that sent Him, and to accomplish His work; [21] and the story leads up to the appointed 'hour' in which the Son of Man is to be 'glorified'—through suffering.[22] In the so-called 'high priestly' prayer the Lord 'consecrates' Himself to the death of sacrifice,[23] and the cry 'It is finished' signalizes the triumphant accomplishment of the Saviour's task.[24] The Good Shepherd lays down His life for the sheep.[25] The Resurrection leads on to the Ascension.[26] The Fourth Gospel is an interpretation of the story set forth in the earlier Gospels, but it is a true interpretation, and an interpretation in terms of the same Gospel which the Synoptists also proclaim.

The analytical and critical study of the books of the New Testament, pursued by the patient industry of generations of scholars, has enabled the modern mind to draw fruitful discriminations, and to distinguish clearly the successive phases of christological doctrine—that is to say, of Christian thought and belief about Christ—within the period covered by the New Testament itself; but, in the process, there was for a time a real danger of the seamless robe being torn, and of the essential unity of the New Testament testimony to Jesus Christ as Messiah, Saviour, and Lord, as the world's Redeemer, and as the only-begotten Son of God, becoming obscured. In more recent years there has been a recovery. The gains of the previous period have not been lost; but there has been a recovered sense of that deeper 'Unity of the New Testament,' underlying the differences, which it is the purpose and aim of this series of articles to exhibit and to set forth.

[1] R. H. Charles, *The Revelation of St. John*, i. p. cxiv.
[2] Jn 8^{58}. [3] Jn 1^{14}. [4] Jn 10^{30} 14^{28}.
[5] Jn 3^{13} 6^{62} 16^{28}. [6] Jn 14^{6}.
[7] Jn $5^{23.\ 36.\ 37}$ 6^{57} $8^{16.\ 18}$, etc. [8] Jn 4^{42}.
[9] Jn 1^{29}. [10] Jn 5^{23}. [11] Jn 14^{9}.
[12] Jn 14^{7}. [13] Jn 5^{40} 6^{33} 10^{28}.
[14] Jn $6^{32.\ 51}$. [15] Jn $1^{4ff.}$ 9^{5} 12^{46} 8^{12} 12^{35}.
[16] Jn 4^{6}. [17] Jn 11^{35}. [18] Jn 12^{27}.
[19] Jn 13^{21}. [20] Jn 19^{28}. [21] Jn 4^{34}.
[22] Jn 12^{23} $13^{31f.}$
[23] Jn 17^{19} (R.V. m.). [24] Jn 19^{30}.
[25] Jn 10^{11}. [26] Jn 20^{17}.

Literature.

WILLIAM OF GLASSHAMPTON.

William of Glasshampton: Friar, Monk, Solitary (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net) is an affectionately written book, by Geoffrey Curtis, C.R., which tells the story of a dedicated spirit, who, hearing what he took to be God's call, responded to it with enthusiasm; and, seeing what seemed to him to be the supreme need of the Church these days, abandoned everything to play his part in that. William Sirr, left poor and fatherless, had a thin and inadequate education. Apparently the world's worst examinee, he was at last accepted for the priesthood by Bishop Creighton, after another

abject failure, and in spite of the examiners' adverse report. As all who have worked in a theological college know, that is a dangerous thing to do, since experience proves that these undisciplined minds are apt, subsequently, to cause trouble in their ministry. Yet there are cases where the rules cannot be applied with all their usual rigidity. To Creighton this seemed one of them. For if he was no scholar, Sirr had other aptitudes for the priesthood in notable degree. He was never a preacher; yet he did have an appeal which, by its very simplicity, got home to many. And his personality was an asset of real value. Winsome and lovable, humorous and human, a man of violent extremes, now in the seventh heaven, now sunk deep in spiritual gloom, chafed beyond endurance by the ordinary clerical dress, yet moving about, entirely at his ease, in a friar's garments; devoted to his fellows, and spending himself for them royally, and yet retiring into solitude, and living alone for the best part of twenty years, there was something of Simon Peter in this man, something of that impetuous impulsiveness which, one day, quite needlessly, wanted to walk upon the sea; and, on another occasion, plunged into the waters, when he would have done better pulling his fair share at the oars. Yet in both men there was a real affection for Christ, in and behind things, which, in themselves, were ill balanced and stupid.

Chesterton tells us of Francis of Assisi that he was a lover of God, and also, calling it a rarer vocation, a real lover of men. That was true of this man too. As a young fellow he lived in a common lodging-house, exactly as the others did; later he worked in a Settlement for lepers, washing the clothes; he joined Adderley's Society of the Divine Compassion which cares for the most desperate of cases, and rose to be, for six years, its Superior; he was passionately moved by the plight of the unemployed, whether always wisely is another question. Did he not once tell Stanley Baldwin who was visiting him, 'I have been a Bolshevik all my life'? He had real influence over men the Church seldom touches. And yet, with deliberation, he threw all that away. For he was sure that we are making a mistake in assuming that the most that we can do for God, the best that we can offer Him, is to be energetic and hard breathing and tireless in our own service of Him; held that we shall be much more effective if we give our lives to setting in motion the unreckonable possibilities of prayer. On that belief he himself acted. He was gifted a part of a spacious far-spreading park in Worcestershire, with trees and glades and glimpses of far hills; and in it a ruined stable, built on the ample scale of centuries ago. There he sought to found a monastery; and working, at first all alone and with inadequate tools, transformed the place into a scene of flowers and loveliness. But the monks did not come. And, accepting the breaking of his dream as the will of God, the man became a solitary; lost, for a great part of the day, in prayer; and refusing invitations even to preach. For they, too, would call him away from his appointed task. That William of Glasshampton was a deeply religious man is beyond question. That he was devoted to the Lord Christ that Christ has, no doubt, Himself gladly acknowledged. And yet his religion seems a stuffy, airless, superheated kind of thing, not in all ways attractive. When, for example, one comes on this, 'Not only does the life here lack many things which make the Cloistered Life, but it is without that which is of the very essence of monasticism, and as I believe, of Holy Religion itself—the complete exclusion of women from the cloister and its precincts. The fact that those women are or may be Religious (nursing the patients both women and men) does not minimize that evil, it rather aggravates it,' the thought will rise up in the mind that it is at least just barely possible that the Lord God Almighty knew as well as Mr. Sirr what He was doing when, male and female created He them; and called women, as well as men, to the service of His Kingdom. Or, when one reads, 'The Rector says he will come once a week so that I can say Mass. And I hope soon to have our dear Lord in the House with me,' one can only look up and smile at the Christ who, day by day and all the day, stands so loyally to His promise, 'Lo, I am with you all the days.' And, as it seems at least, He smiles back. Still, it takes all kinds to make a world. And most of them, perhaps all of them, are required. But it is well indeed that God is the God of patience. For He must need it when He deals with those queer little creatures of His that we call men.

A. J. Gossip.

A GREAT ACHIEVEMENT.

The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible, edited by Professor G. E. Wright of McCormick University and Professor F. V. Filson of the same University, with an introductory article by Professor W. F. Albright of John Hopkins University (S.C.M.; 25s. net).

The words used above are not a bit too strong. To handle this atlas, to gaze at the plates, to take plates and letterpress together, is a really thrilling experience. I have never seen maps like these. However small the print in which the names of places are given they are clearly seen; they stand out so that one does not need to use a magnifying glass; the imperfect eye of a short-sighted person will find no difficulty at all in reading the names. The colouring of the plates is beautiful. It is subdued but entirely satisfactory. In short, on a surface inspection, the plates are a joy.

The aim of the editors has been to supply a series of maps which will set forth clearly and vividly the geographical setting of the Biblical story. The explanatory chapters which accompany and explain the maps contain a concise history of the Hebrews during Biblical times. Carefully selected photographs accompany the maps and the text. I could wish a student of Scripture few greater pleasures than to go through this Atlas, reading the written history with one eye and the other on the map (metaphorically, of

course). I can remember the wonderful experience of reading Sir George Adam Smith's 'Historical Geography of the Holy Land.' I felt I was set up for life as a teacher of the Bible. Here was a book more fascinating than a thriller, and a life-long possession. Something of the same kind awaits the reader of this book.

A new Biblical Atlas was needed. In recent decades extensive exploration has added greatly to our geographical knowledge of Bible lands, and an epoch-making advance in the methods and achievements of archæological work along with a hitherto unattained correlation of the discoveries in the Mediterranean and Near East have all combined to further the advance made in our generation. To my dismay, Professor Albright, in his Introduction, says of Sir George Adam Smith's great book that, while it was abreast of contemporary scholarship when it appeared, 'it has become more and more antiquated with the progress of investigation.' That may be true of detailed sites but nothing will ever make its broad outlines and conclusion out-of-date. I have not noticed any reference to Sir George's splendid two guinea Atlas of Bible lands, a book different in plan from this one but more comprehensive. It contains plates of economic Palestine as well as political.

I have not fully described all the merits of the *Westminster Atlas*. One of these is an index of sites which will enable a reader to look up any place mentioned in the Bible and find its locale. Another attraction is Professor Albright's introductory chapter in which he tells us 'how we excavate in the Near East,' 'how ancient dates are fixed,' 'how ancient sites are identified,' and 'how written documents are interpreted.' And of course there are the seventy-seven photographs which in their way are as significant as the maps. I suppose that even this up-to-date work will be antiquated by and by. But it will remain for long a really valuable possession.

F. J. Rae.

POLITICS AND MORALS.

An English rendering of any book by Benedetto Croce is to be warmly welcomed, for Croce is one of the most eminent philosophers of our time, and one of the most significant of European thinkers. We do wish that this work of his, *Politics and Morals* (Allen & Unwin; 8s. 6d. net), had been given an 'Introduction,' either by himself or by the translator, who, himself bearing an Italian name, Salvatore J. Castiglione, has done his translating singularly well. An Introduction was highly desirable. For one thing, the ordinary reader unfamiliar with Croce's general philosophical position, will be sometimes puzzled, as when he reads, 'there exists not Truth but the thought which thinks, not Good but moral volition, not Beauty but poetic and artistic activity; not the State but political actions.' For another thing, *Etica e Politica* was first published in 1931, and one would like to learn, and indeed has a right to know, if it is that work as it then stood that here puts on English dress. For since that time dreadful things have happened which have given the problem of the relationship between politics and ethics altogether fresh poignancy. For still another thing, one is not too sure what this work is, or aims at. Is it a book? Or a collection of closely related Essays? Well, with that preliminary complaint over, one may proceed to the work as it is presented. It is a worth-while work, as anything from Croce's pen must be. It does not solve or attempt to solve any of the concrete politico-ethical problems with which the practical man is busy. But it does clear the ground.

One will not err in saying that what strikes one as its first great merit is to warn so clearly and so often against the idolatry of abstract nouns. We are so apt to write them on our banners, and assign them a value and even a meaning which they do not of themselves possess; words like 'equality,' 'liberty,' 'force,' and so on. Croce shows how 'equality' without ever so many qualifications would mean anarchy. And the State! What, he begs us to ask, is this 'State'? In brief he impresses on us that the State in the end is you, and I, and the rest of us; that the State is what you and I make it, and that therefore our 'morals' are supremely important, and any 'idolatry' of the State supremely irrational.

Next the student of what used to be called 'political philosophy' will find here in brief compass an illuminating account and judicious criticism of the main types of theory as to the rise of the State and its prerogatives—the views of Machiavelli and Vico, Rousseau, Hegel, Haller (who has been too undeservedly much forgotten), and some eclectic theories. One wishes that Croce had given some space to Hobbes, or Locke, but what one has is excellent.

Then there is the view of what one may call the mode if not the law of all human progress in politics as elsewhere. A 'thesis' develops an 'antithesis'; these are more or less reconciled in a 'synthesis.' But that synthesis in its turn becomes 'thesis,' sooner or later evolving 'antithesis,' and that process goes on and on. So Croce reminds us not to pin faith in any League of Nations, as though that were the end of our troubles.

Passing over, because of space-considerations, much that is interesting and suggestive about political parties, 'Liberalism,' or Church and State, the mention of the word 'troubles' suggests one's last point. Of the troubles, problems, perplexities and dangers that confront humanity Croce is fully aware, but in his last chapter he gives some encouragement against pessimism. 'Once we have found the true centre, we must not go slipping again toward the outside, and treat our own spirit as a force to be influenced by more or less external means.' If that is rather vague religion, it is at least in line with religion.

W. D. Niven.

The Oxford Pastorate, by the Rev. G. Ian F. Thomson, M.A., with a Foreword by the Rt.

Rev. Christopher M. Chavasse, D.D., Bishop of Rochester (Canterbury Press ; 7s. 6d. net), is the record of a remarkable Movement in Oxford University. The ' Pastorate ' was an endeavour to bring into a Tractarian preserve the spirit and influence of the Evangelical Revival. It was a kind of chaplaincy, and has been held by remarkable men—men like the Bishop of Rochester's well-known father. The present account of its history is meant to celebrate its jubilee, and the story is told with skill and enthusiasm. The book will be acceptable to evangelical circles, especially that which is identified with the University.

A very good book of popular apologetic has been written by the Rev. Douglas W. Thomson, C.F., *The Wisdom of the Way* (Epworth Press ; 5s. net). The book has a special value as it arose out of talks in an Italian prison camp. The Chaplain was pressed, almost challenged, with questions from fellow-prisoners, and out of these discussions came an ordered view of the writer's own beliefs. Mr. Thomson deals in a definite way with all the big questions, and, as might be expected from the origin of the book, in a broad and human way. The four divisions of the book are : The Faith, The Fellowship, The Life, and The Future.

The Rev. L. J. Baggott, Vicar of Great Yarmouth, is of opinion that Anglican theology has become woefully weak on its devotional side ; and in *Jesu, Joy of Man's Desiring* (Longmans ; 6s. net) he offers us a book of devotional writing. His subjects are Penitence, Faith, Suffering, Love, Prayer, Sacrament. They are great subjects, but his treatment of them is well sustained throughout. The style is clear and pointed, and there is an abundant use of illustration, old and new. The working preacher will find it a helpful volume. It is also, what it was intended to be, a volume of real devotional value.

The one kind of book from which ministers plagiarize with little scruple is a volume of sermons to children. It has become a kind of convention, and those who publish their children's sermons must look for this. If they are good sermons the author of them will probably hear the gist of one of them preached in a strange church. And the fortunate thing about these publications is that so many of them are really good, even first-rate. One can say this freely about *The Singing Mountains*, by the Rev. R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc. (Lutterworth Press ; 4s. net). The man who can't find a really good sermon for children here must be hard to please.

The Divine Plan of Missions, by W. E. Vine, M.A. (Pickering & Inglis ; 5s. net), is written with the laudable purpose of finding out from the Scriptures themselves what God's plans are for the proclamation of the gospel to the world, ' plans that have been eternally predetermined both as to time and mode of accomplishment.' Its aim is to lead us to search the Scriptures ' for conformity to the divine will.' The writer is fully conscious of the urgency of the call and of the greatness of the present opportunity. Whether, however, he takes always the right way of finding out how the Scriptures can most fruitfully be searched may be doubted. ' There was no appeal to the churches by the missionaries to send out labourers,' therefore no such appeal should be made. ' To apply the term " church " to the believers living in a country . . . is inconsistent with the teaching of Scripture.' ' The baptism of infants has no warrant whatever in Scripture.' These conclusions may be right or wrong but they should hardly be affirmed as *ex cathedra* expositions of the mind of God. Surely ' the will of God ' which is central to every Christian purpose is not to be interpreted in any legal spirit. There are perils that beset every one who seeks to discern the mind of God and to apply it to man's acts in any age, and this guide is not, any more than others, an infallible interpreter of that mind.

A sound piece of work has been done in a survey of the history of Christianity in Iceland—*Icelandic Church Saga*, by the Rev. John C. F. Hood, D.D. (S.P.C.K. ; 16s. net). Dr. Hood has gone to the original sources, and the list of books read and consulted is extensive enough to show that a vast amount of hard work has gone to the building up of the story. Dr. Hood has not been overwhelmed, however, by the load of his authorities. He gives date and place for everything, but he has preserved a freedom and elasticity in his narrative which make it always interesting. Glimpses of church and social life in Iceland, of national customs and festivals, give a human brightness to what might well be dull and pedestrian. This will be the standard ' Life ' of the Icelandic Church, and its thoroughness reflects great credit on its author.

Man's Disorder and God's Design (S.C.M. ; 1s. 6d. net) is described as an ' Outline of Preparation for the First General Assembly of the World Council of Churches.' The editor is Professor John C. Bennett, and in the Foreword we are told by President Henry P. Van Dusen of Union Theological Seminary, New York, that the World Council, in process of formation since 1938, will come formally into existence with the first session of the Assembly, which meets in Amsterdam on 24th August 1948. There are now ninety-nine Churches from thirty-three countries and almost every major branch of Christendom (except the Roman Catholic Church) in the membership of the World Council. It is to be noted that the World Council is not to consist of a series of conferences but is to be a continuing body, functioning regularly. As the title of the brochure indicates, the theme of the first General Assembly will be ' God's Design for His World.'

The Use of the Participle for the Imperative in the New Testament.

By the Reverend H. G. Meecham, M.A., D.D., Hartley Victoria College, Manchester.

Dr. David Daube has written an important excursus on 'Participle and Imperative in 1 Peter.'[1] He holds that the current explanation of this usage is unsatisfactory. It is the aim of this article to review his criticisms of the papyri instances cited by J. H. Moulton,[2] and then to examine probable occurrences in the New Testament.

Two preliminary observations may be made. The absolute use of the participle in an independent sentence is not as unlikely as may at first appear. It has analogies in the ancient use of the infinitive in an imperatival sense without direct dependence on a verb, and in the Hellenistic use of participle for indicative.[3] Nevertheless certain tests must be made in each instance. Any supposed example may be ruled out if the participle is (*a*) textually uncertain, (*b*) grammatically connected with a preceding or following finite verb (in which case the participle is not absolute), (*c*) due to loose apposition or to anacoluthon. On one or more of these grounds the following New Testament passages may be excluded from our survey:[4] Lk 24^{47}, 2 Co 8^{24} $9^{11.\ 13}$, Eph 4^{2-3} 5^{19-21}, He 13^{5}, 1 P 1^{14} 2^{12}. There is, however, a residuum of possible and indeed probable instances of the participle with imperatival force, namely, Ro 12^{9-19}, Col 3^{16}, 1 P 2^{18} $3^{1.\ 7(9).\ 16}$ 4^{8-10}.

Before testing this remainder we must review Dr. Daube's treatment of the papyri examples cited by J. H. Moulton. We examine two of the three instances to which he reduces Moulton's list of seven, and add two others for consideration.

G 35 (i/B.C.): ἑαυτῶν δὲ ἐπιμελόμενοι ἵν' ὑγιαίνητε. ἔσμεν ἐν Πτολεμαίδι. ἔρρωσθε.

The intervening sentence ἔσμεν ἐν Πτολεμαίδι seems to preclude the possibility of construing ἐπιμελόμενοι with ἔρρωσθε; nor is it satisfactory to attribute the intruding words to the writer's carelessness, as Dr. Daube does. True, we must allow some degree of laxity in the colloquial style of letter-writing. Nevertheless the sentence ἔσμεν ἐν Πτολεμαίδι does break the sequence of both thought and language. Dr. Daube's earlier admission (p. 467) that 'we are almost forced to treat it (the participle) as an imperative' supports the presumption that in similar epistolary formulae with ἔρρωσθε the participle should be regarded as imperatival, and not be construed, after the classical manner, with the finite verb. In point of fact, ἔρρωσθε frequently stands *solitarium* as a final salutation in papyri letters[5] (cf. the correlative εὐτύχει). Many examples of this detached ἔρρωσθε may be seen, for example, in Witkowski's collection.[6]

P. Tebt. 59 (B.C. 99): ἐν οἷς ἐὰν προσδέησθέ μου, ἐπιτάσσοντές μοι προθυμότερον διὰ τὸ ἄνωθεν φοβεῖσθαι καὶ σέβεσθαι τὸ ἱερόν. ἔρρωσθε.

Dr. Daube thinks, as also Witkowski,[7] that ἐπιτάσσοντες should be taken with ἔρρωσθε. A. T. Robertson,[8] however, supports Moulton and regards the imperatival usage here as 'very clear.' We suggest that the ἐπιτάσσοντες is correlative to the indefinite relative (virtually conditional) clause ἐν οἷς ἐὰν κτλ. and seems naturally to take the place of a finite verb. 'So, whatever you may require, do not hesitate to command my services,' etc. (Edd.). To link ἐπιτάσσοντες with ἔρρωσθε is in effect to make the latter the apodosis of the preceding clause and thus distort the meaning of the passage.[9]

Two further instances from the papyri may be considered:

P. Amh. ii. $39^{16ff.}$: ἐν οἷς ἂν οὖν ὑμῶν προσδέωνται, ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι καὶ ὑμῖν δὲ γράφοντας, ὑπὲρ ὧν αἱρεῖσθε, ὡς πᾶν προθυμότερον τελεωθησόμενον, ἐπιμελόμενοι δὲ καὶ ἑαυτῶν ἵν' ὑνιαίνητε, ἔρρωσθε.

Here ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι and γράφοντας (=ες) are probably imperatival. They can hardly be taken with the distant ἔρρωσθε, with two subordinate clauses and a participle intervening. We suggest

[1] In E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, Appended Note, pp. 467–488.

[2] *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, i. 180 ff. 223 ff.

[3] Moulton, *op. cit.*, pp. 222 f.; Radermacher, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*,[2] p. 205.

[4] It should be noted, however, that several modern translators take the participle imperatively in Eph 4^{3} (Goodspeed), 5^{19-21} (Weymouth, Moffatt, Goodspeed, as also, with the *Revised Standard Version* He 13^{5}), 1 P 1^{14} 2^{12} (Weymouth, Goodspeed, and *R.S.V.* Moffatt accepts 1 P 2^{12} but not 1^{14}).

[5] As also in classical usage.

[6] *Epistulæ Privatæ Græcæ*[2]. For the Greek Bible cf. 2 Macc 11^{21}, Ac 15^{29}.

[7] *Op cit.*, p. 113.

[8] *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, p. 945.

[9] It is significant that the whole passage ἐν οἷς ἐὰν κτλ. follows a genitive absolute, a fact which Dr. Daube records.

a series of imperatival participles here: 'in whatever they ask of you, help them and write to us (ὑμῖν for ἡμῖν). . . . Take care of yourselves that you may be well. Good-bye.' See Moulton, i. 223, n.1.

P. Fay. 109[10] (early i/A.D.): καὶ νῦν παρακληθεὶς νομίσας, ὅτι κιχρᾷς μοι [αὐτούς], μὴ κατάσχῃς Κλέωνα κ.τ.λ.

'Now, therefore, please consider that you are lending the money to me, and don't keep Cleon waiting,' etc. 'νομίσας: Partizipium f. Imperativ.'[1]

This evidence from the papyri is admittedly slender. But it appears to show that in epistolary formulae at least the participle is sometimes used for the imperative. A variant formula which employs two imperatives seems to support this equivalence.[2]

We turn now to consider probable instances of the usage in the New Testament.[3]

Ro 12[9-19]: in this hortatory passage the imperatival sense of the participle is marked. Note the alternation of adjective and participle, and the apparent equivalence ([14-16]) of imperative, infinitive (imperatival), and participle, and ([19]) of participle and aorist imperative. The modern translators largely agree. The R.V. takes the participles as imperatival in [9. 16-19]. Moffatt prefers to take the two participles in [9] as amplificatory of ἀγάπη; but he regards προηγούμενοι ([10]) as imperatival, as also the participles in [11-13. 16-19]. Weymouth, Goodspeed, and *R.S.V.* agree. Blass-Debrunner[4] say: 'es sieht also ganz so aus, als ob P. das schildernde Partiz. als gleichwertig mit dem Imper. ansähe.'

Col 3[16]: the three participles here may possibly be an irregular adjunct to ὑμῖν: 'let the word of Christ dwell in you richly, as you teach,' etc. (*R.S.V.*). Cf. 2 Co 1[7]. But a direct command seems preferable in the context.[5] So Weymouth, Moffatt, Goodspeed. Lightfoot[6] agrees, but cautions that a participle itself has no imperatival force.

1 P 2[18] 3[1. 7]: these may be taken together as showing participles having an apparently imperatival force. Some scholars link them with the remote ὑποτάγητε ([13]), the same general exhortation being carried forward with different special applications. Others relate the participle in 2[18] with the τιμήσατε of [17]. In either case the connexion is strained. It seems more natural to find here the participle used in lieu of the imperative. Cf. 3[1] (ὑποτασσόμεναι) with Col 3[18] (ὑποτάσσεσθε).[7]

1 P 3[16]: here the case is less clear. ἔχοντες may be co-ordinate with ἕτοιμοι ([15]), both being epexegetic of ἁγιάσατε ([15]). It may be noted, however, that some modern translators take the participle imperativally (*R.S.V.*, Goodspeed).

1 P 4[8-10]: possibly ἔχοντες and διακονοῦντες are to be attached to the imperatives of [7]. But again the context rather favours an independent imperatival force. (So Moffatt, Weymouth, Goodspeed, *R.S.V.*).

It does not fall within the scope of this article to discuss whether the use of participles in such hortatory passages is due to the influence of Hebrew codes, and whether they originally served to introduce sections of the primitive catechism.[8] The above examples, however, seem to support Moulton's plea that the imperatival participle is a genuine, if somewhat rare, development in Hellenistic Greek.

[1] B. Olsson, *Papyrusbriefe aus der frühesten Römerzeit*, p. 188.

[2] ἔρρωσο, πρὸ πάντων σατοῦ ἐπιμελοῦ, ἵνα ὑγιαίνῃς, No. 35 in Friedrich Bilabel, *Griechische Papyri*. See also No. 41: ἔρρωσο ἐπιμέλου σεαυτῶ. Can we discriminate between τὰ ἄλλα σαυτοῦ ἐπιμελόμενος ἵν' ὑγιαίνῃς· ἔρρωσο (P. Tebt. 12[12f.]) and τὰ δὲ ἄλλα ἐπιμέλου σαυτοῦ, ἵν' ὑγιαίνῃς· ἔρρωσο (P. Tebt. 55[9ff.])?

[3] Dr. Daube accepts these (he does not mention 1 P 3[16]) and some of the possible examples excluded above, but offers a different explanation of the usage.

[4] *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*,[5] § 468, 2.

[5] Note the omitted imperative in [17].

[6] *Commentary on Colossians*, p. 222.

[7] In Eph 5[22] the verbal form is lacking; but note the preceding ὑποτασσόμενοι ([21]).

[8] E. G. Selwyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 387 (Selwyn), 471 ff. (Daube).

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

A Story of Romany.

By the Reverend G. M. George, Paisley.

'I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear: but now mine eye seeth thee.'—Job 42[5].

Romany was a charming personality on the B.B.C. who used to tell stories of the life of the fields and the woods. Children were entranced by his beautiful tales of birds and animals and all the world of Nature. He was so well known that wherever he appeared in public he would draw many people who loved to listen to what he had to say.

One evening, when he had been addressing a big meeting in a church, he found that there were many young people waiting to speak to him before he left. Some of them had little books in

their hands, and pens ready! We can easily guess what they wanted: his autograph, of course. And Romany was hurrying for a train, and didn't know how he was going to deal with them all, there were so many of them. But in the midst of the crowd there was one girl who came forward to say that it wasn't an autograph she wanted. 'I want to speak to him because I know him; he is a friend of mine,' she told the minister at the vestry door. So she was taken in to speak to Romany.

'Well, my dear,' said Romany to the little girl, 'and how do you know me?'

'Oh,' she replied, 'you stayed in our house when I was a very little baby.'

Now that doesn't seem much to claim a friendship on, does it? And yet to that girl it was a very great deal. You see, her parents must often have spoken to her about that great man who had come to stay in the house when she was a tiny baby. Then, when she grew older, she had listened to his voice on the wireless; until at last the day came when she met him face to face, and claimed him for her friend.

There is a parable in that story of our friendship with Jesus. We learn of Him first through our parents. When children are brought to be baptized we think of how much it means that Jesus should be with them in their homes when they are little babies. We remember how important it is that parents should tell their children about Him. Then, as boys and girls grow up, they learn to listen to His voice for themselves, and take notice of the wonderful things He has to tell them. And all this is in preparation for the great day when they meet Him face to face, and claim Him as their own Great Friend.

But that is not all the story. As Romany was letting the little girl out of the vestry door, he said to her before she left, 'Will you give me a kiss, then?' So there, in the presence of many others who scarcely knew Romany at all, the girl showed how much his friendship meant to her.

We often say that Jesus is a Friend of ours. If we do so, we may be sure that the day will come when He asks us, as He asked Peter, 'Lovest thou me?' And then we have to show, before other people, how much His love means to us. It is not always easy to show it when we are with others who do not know Him as we do: but to learn to 'stand up for Jesus' is one of the greatest things in life.

Can You Tell Me the Way?

By the Reverend Donald Ford, B.A., Runcorn.

'If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God.'—Ja 1[5].

The minister was perplexed. For the first time for four years he was in London. He knew exactly where he wanted to go, but did not know how to get there. Without any trouble at all he had come from Euston Station to St. James' Underground Station which, he had been told, was most convenient for Buckingham Gate, but when he left the platform behind him and stood on the pavement outside the Station there was nothing he recognized as a landmark and he had not the least idea in which direction to start walking.

'There is only one thing to do,' he told himself. 'I must ask a passer-by. Anybody will be able to put me right.' Two men came towards him and they both carried despatch cases under their arms, which suggested that they were city business men, just the sort of men likely to be of most use. 'Can you tell me the way to Buckingham Gate, please?' said the minister.

'Sorry, I do not understand,' answered one of the men. Thinking that there might be something wrong with his accent the minister tried again, this time speaking very slowly and distinctly. Again the reply was the same. 'Sorry, I do not understand.' The two men moved away and, as they spoke to one another, the minister could not help overhearing their conversation. He discovered that they were not English. Then he knew why the answer to his question had been, 'Sorry, I do not understand.' The men to whom he had appealed for help knew only one or two phrases of English and 'Sorry, I do not understand' was one of them.

Obviously there was only one thing left to be done, and that was to try again. Here was a likely looking stranger approaching. The minister moved towards him and both men began to speak at the same time and to ask the very same question. 'Can you tell me the way . . .' Then they stopped and began to laugh. The minister knew the answer to the question asked in the New Testament, 'Can the blind lead the blind?'

Now there were two strangers to London who wanted to reach Buckingham Gate and they decided that they would take no more risks of asking people who either did not understand or who did not know. They agreed that they must seek one man who could be trusted and who, without any doubt, would be able to give careful direction. In a very short time they had found a policeman and he gave them all the information they required. 'Buckingham Gate? Walk to the end of this street, turn sharp to the right, then right again when you are under the big blue sign marked "Underground." You are only a couple of hundred yards away.'

What a lot of people there are to whom we turn for guidance about life, but how many there are who are unable to give us the directions we need. Some fail us because they do not understand what we are asking about; others fail because they themselves are as ignorant of the right way as we are. There is One to whom we may turn and who will never fail us. He understands us and our lives. He knows all there is to know about life and has even left a guide-book to help us. The name of this One to whom we may turn when we are uncertain of our way . . .? Jesus. The name of the guide-book . . .? The New Testament.

Those who turn to Him and use His Book are never lost. He gives them wisdom, the wisdom He has received from God, His Father.

The Christian Year.

SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION DAY.

The Resurrection of the Body.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN GRAY, B.D., JORDANHILL COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

'Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.'—Lk 24^{39}.

It is not only in our brother Paul that there are things hard to understand. The same is often true of the Gospels which are accounted so much simpler. Never is this more notable than when we try to discover what really happened when Jesus, risen from the dead, met with His own disciples. Mark merely speaks of His appearing, but tells too of His walking with two of them in another form. Matthew actually makes them hold His feet. But Luke with much elaboration and detail, found nowhere else, but perhaps hinted at in John, shows that when Jesus appeared it was in a recognizable body, able to walk and talk, even apparently able to eat, yet a body of such a kind that He was not known instantly to them until He had pointed them to the marks of His wounds, or, in the Emmaus story, was made known by some characteristic gesture. These stories may represent a growing materializing of that which, at first, might be argued to have been a vision; but it seems far more likely that all these writers had in their minds the same thought, that He who met them after the Resurrection was no disembodied wraith. 'A spirit,' Luke records our Lord as saying, 'hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.' Not the soul but the eyes and the hands could apprehend this Risen Lord. Paul's evidence in 1 Corinthians is probably earlier written evidence even than any traditions behind the Gospels, and he, too, reiterates that the Lord was seen, adding nothing of vision or dreams, merely stating the fact that the Lord was seen. It is all very perplexing, and to our ideas rather difficult. Yet here is the evidence of the records. Nor are we able conveniently to forget them, for what they are seeking to convey is enshrined also in the Apostle's Creed, 'I believe in The Resurrection of the body.' And (our own subordinate standard) the Westminster Confession, adds its agreement: 'All the dead shall be raised up with the selfsame bodies, and none other, although with different qualities, which shall be united again to their souls for ever'—a repetition for all men of what is regarded as true of Jesus, in His resurrection the first-born of many brethren.

This line of thought may have had its beginning in the fact that the Tomb was found empty. But it is not necessary to argue as some would that the Tomb is *deduced* empty merely because the disciples believed Jesus to be alive, and on their own ideas of immortality presumed that His body and soul had come together again. For the thought of Ezekiel in his description of the valley of dry bones would be the thought of many, that God's Spirit could put together and animate the dead body of a man. Therefore if Jesus were alive and among them, His body could no longer be in the Tomb. This is to be over subtle. That the Tomb was found empty is not received with complacency but with amazement. At the last trump perhaps bodies would leave their tombs, but after three days! The disciples record the Tomb as empty because it really was empty. The body of the Lord was somehow gone, and the Lord in a body had been seen among them. The empty Tomb then is additional evidence of this emphasis on the resurrection of the body. Jesus' body though dead and buried was allowed to know neither the change nor the decay of other men. Hamlet musing over poor Yorick's skull is a reminder of what happens to all of us. It did not happen to Jesus. The words of the Psalmist were fulfilled. God did not suffer His Holy One to see corruption.

From this, the question which was asked in Corinth apparently about all men must be asked by us first about Jesus. 'How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?' St. Paul regards the question as futile and calls the 'some man,' who asks it, 'Thou fool.' Yet the question does persist in our minds, what kind of body was this which Jesus bore, connected apparently with the body which had been His earthly tabernacle, and yet now with it He is able to appear and disappear, to pass through walls, and to transcend the normal bodily laws. The connexion between the two bodies Paul tries to explain by way of metaphor. The seed buried in the ground dies, and the grain comes forth. The grain was in germ in the seed and is yet not the seed. So Christ's risen body and the body of His appearing are connected one with the other, and the God who makes the seed grow is also the Creator of the resurrection body. How can we deny that this is so—we whose bodies are not the same to-day as they were when we were children, and change perpetually? But when it comes to describing what that body is like, language fails. 'The same and none other but with different powers,' says the Confession. 'A spiritual body,' says St. Paul, with what to our minds is a daring contradiction of language. 'God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body.' Yet from all this it still remains true that the Risen Jesus according to the Scriptures had a body of some kind, and the resurrection of the body therefore has some meaning for faith.

Yet in regions like these where even Paul, claiming to show us a mystery, leaves us faint yet pursuing, speculation might seem to be idle, and the affirmation of the Creed, 'I believe . . . in the resurrection of the body,' better left aside altogether. After all, what does it matter whether Jesus rose in a body, or whether we shall rise soul and body joined at the last day? The gospel would have won a readier acceptance at least at Athens and Corinth if this had been left out. But it would not have been the gospel as it had been revealed in the raising of Jesus from the dead, and we would be robbed of the real hope of salva-

tion. For we believe that God made us both soul and body. We have no knowledge of ourselves but as these two commingled, each influencing and acting upon the other, so that only theoretically they can be separated. God does not deliver a good spirit out of an evil body. He forgives the whole man and raises the whole man from the dead. There can be no false division between spiritual and material, as if God made one and the devil the other. God made both and redeems both. There is the glorious truth of the resurrection of the body shown forth in the Risen Jesus. Why should it be thought a thing impossible that God, who is perpetually changing our bodies, should clothe our forgiven spirits in a new body? The Incarnation meant that Jesus took all of man. The resurrection of His body means that all of man can likewise be raised to the same glory. Jesus is able to give us eternal life, not only after death, but here and now. Is that not reflected in the body as well as within the spirit? The fruits of forgiveness are often deeds and bearing as well as some inner peace of mind. The resurrection of the body is faith's affirmation that God's good work will be carried on after death, and our whole selves capable of service will rise, not vague spirits to be merged in a vaguer and greater Spirit we call God.

Moreover the resurrection of the body is the guarantee of God's good end to all things. Heaven and earth shall pass away but there shall be a new heaven and a new earth. He who can renew the dead body can renew His whole creation till again He shall find it good.

WHITSUNDAY.

The Spirit of Peace.

BY THE REVEREND R. J. WEDDERSPOON, M.A., CHEAM, SURREY.

'I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh.'—Ac 2^{17}.

While the message of Whitsuntide may be primarily addressed to the Church, it has a peculiar relevance to the special need of our time in Church and State alike. It is generally agreed that a fumbling and groping impotence is the chief characteristic of our endeavours in every department of life. We strive hard enough; we were never more conscious of the magnificence of our ideals; frustration, however, is our constant attendant, and deferment of hope our only established reward. The chariot wheels drive heavily: small wonder if at times the charioteer be discouraged. It may be true that, on occasion,

> . . . some strange thoughts transcend our wonted themes,
> And into glory peep.

But we desire more than just a fleeting peep into glory. We should like to see glory captured and domesticated; or if glory be too much to hope for or expect, we could certainly welcome life with an added radiance. That, however, is assuredly not our portion at the moment. Life's hue in these days is sombre, and its attire is hodden grey. We wait for something, and it does not come.

In the life of the Church there is much loyal and devoted service. With infinite care and patience the wood is laid upon the altar, but there is an absence of the authentic flame. There are no leaping and glowing fires, and consequently no scorching of men's hearts, no visible destruction of the masses of wood, hay, and stubble that serve as substitutes for the gold of character in all too many lives.

The nation at large has grim reminders of the seriousness of its position. In the famous White Paper on the Economic Survey there occurs the sentence: 'Unless we concentrate upon these really important things (Production and Exports) *we may never restore the foundations of our national life.*' The italics are mine. Not the frills, but the foundations are imperilled! While in a sphere still wider Bertrand Russell, discussing Atomic Energy and the Outlook for Mankind, can say: 'Never since the beginning of recorded history has mankind been faced by so terrible a problem. . . . The human race has to choose between utter disaster and unexampled well-being . . . no middle course is any longer possible.'

All of this we may set before our minds, not that we may wrap ourselves in gloom, or feed upon despair, but that we may put ourselves in the way of paying special heed to the meaning and message of Pentecost. Once again we are driven, in Church and State alike, to take stock of our resources, and it is not the least part of our duty to realize afresh, in the light of history and experience, the resources we have in God. Judged by human standards and reckonings, our position is perilous enough, and might well give the unbeliever even more concern than it does, but surely no one with access to a New Testament and insight enough to discern its meaning can ever be dismayed, at Whitsuntide especially. 'Ye shall receive power.' That is the great and commanding word. That power, once given, has never been withdrawn, and it may be ours now. Perhaps God, in His Providence, is driving us up against the buffers of defeat, and right to the edge of the precipice of disaster, that, looking over, and being rightly affrighted, we may again determine to listen to His voice.

What, then, may we recognize as God's special word to us now? First, surely this—that there is in life an element of what seems to be the incalculable and the unpredictable. 'The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth.' There are 'times of refreshing from the coming of the Lord,' but their coming can be predicted with little accuracy. In the story of the day of Pentecost in the Book of Acts we cannot forget the phrase, 'And suddenly.' Suddenly! History has many instances of these sudden changes, seemingly so inexplicable, that decisively influence the destiny of men and nations, when even people not usually noted for their spiritual outlook upon life begin to talk about 'miracles.' And truth to say, even when we give

due attention to the fact that the Spirit of God is not erratic and intermittent in His working, even when we declare that it is our heightened powers of perception that make the difference, there remains the instinctive belief in our minds that the Spirit of God can operate, on occasion, with a particular energy of force, just as we feel, also instinctively, if irrationally, that it is possible for the Spirit of God to be withdrawn, an awesome and solemnizing thought. 'And take not Thy Holy Spirit from us.'

Surely, then, the first essential for us to-day is that we should face the future with great expectancy, turning away from ourselves, and believing that, if we have but faith and trust enough, God will do great things for us. 'To every man,' said R. L. Stevenson, 'there comes at times a consciousness that there blows through all the articulations of his body a Spirit that is not his.' We may be fairly certain that such consciousness does not come to the man of limited horizon or stunted faith. The windows of his life must be open towards Jerusalem.

Sir Thomas Beecham has done much to popularize the music of Delius, whom he considers the greatest British composer. A shrewd critic, however, suggests that the appeal of Delius, beautiful though his music is, will always be limited. His range of emotion is 'largely confined to nostalgia, regret, and disheartenedness.' Further he declares that it is the music of a self-centred man, and that it is this moral quality that accounts for the ease with which the sense of beauty passes over in his music to nostalgic regret. But is it not always true that self-centredness shuts us off from the highest success? If the Spirit came suddenly at the first Whitsuntide it was because there was a company of people resolutely waiting upon God, and assured of their entire incapacity without Him. Had they allowed themselves, as so many do to-day, to dwell wistfully upon the glories of a vanished past, it is doubtful whether they might have been able to recognize the Spirit when He came. First and always then, expectancy.

Let it also be remarked that it is generally easy to recognize the Spirit's presence when He comes. There is a sound of a going in the tops of the mulberry trees. As Christina Rossetti sings,

> Who has seen the wind?
> Neither I nor you:
> But when the leaves hang trembling
> The wind is passing thro'.
>
> Who has seen the wind?
> Neither you nor I:
> But when the trees bow down their heads
> The wind is passing by.

If to-day we pray again that the Spirit may be poured out upon all flesh, that the Spirit of Peace may come into the hearts of men and nations alike, may we not forget that, in spite of all fears and forebodings, there are manifest signs and tokens everywhere of the uprising of the desire for Peace. Perhaps the very intensity of our fears is the measure of that desire. St. John Ervine once said something to the effect that we had failed to deck out Peace, and adorn it. All the glamour had been captured by those associated with war. He went on in his whimsical way to say that while people everywhere readily sang, 'Let me like a soldier fall,' nobody ever wanted to sing, 'Let me like a Secretary of the League of Nations fall.' War was an affair of trumpets and uniforms and excitements, Peace drab and unattractive. We had to get the glamour into Peace, and proclaim it with shoutings and brass-bands. But surely the Peace that the Spirit will bring may have rich attraction of its own. It will be recognized by the opportunities it affords, the field of adventure provided, and the resources of God it displays in ample measure. Are not the Scriptural signs available even now? Are there not sons and daughters prophesying, young men seeing visions, old men dreaming dreams? The prophecy is not all secular, the visions and the dreams are not all limited by the horizon of this world. Let us gladly recognize every sign and token of the Spirit's presence now.

And most of all, may we not at Whitsuntide remember that we are called to a new exercise of spiritual power and authority? How completely we seem to have forgotten the original discovery of this power, or so it would appear. When we realize how impressed the world has been by the display of the energy released by nuclear fission, is there not a challenge to us to recover the full measure of our spiritual power? Are we to be intimidated by forces merely physical, when all the time mighty and illimitable resources are at our own command? That is the question Whitsuntide puts to us, reinforced as it is by the experiences of the faithful in all generations.

Henry Vaughan could speak in his famous poem of a country 'far beyond the stars' where 'Sweet Peace is crowned with smiles.' Why may not Peace be crowned here, on earth, as the fruit of the Spirit that can be poured out upon all flesh?

TRINITY SUNDAY.

The God Men Know.

BY THE REVEREND R. W. STEWART, B.D., B.Sc., KILLERMONT.

'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the fellowship of the holy Spirit be with you all.'—2 Co 13^{14} (Moffatt).

A sermon must be more than a lecture, it must commend the gospel. A sermon for Trinity Sunday must urge upon people to believe not vaguely in God but definitely in God who is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Such a sermon can be preached because the doctrine of the Trinity is not a mere theological theory but a description of the religious experience of Christian men.

Nowadays it may seem a simple and obvious truth that if a man has any religious belief at all he must believe in one God. Yet there were ages when it was judged quite reasonable to believe in

numbers of gods—gods for each nation, gods of the sea and of each land, gods of peace and war, gods of wood and field and family—and that it might be wise for a man to worship several. As a matter of history it has been chiefly through the influence of Hebrew prophecy that men have come to recognize that the very idea of God means above all a God of righteousness which is the same always and everywhere. Human law may vary according to time and place but it does not make sense to think of a God whose holy will is the supreme moral law within a certain boundary. Once religion becomes ethical and the moral standard is identified with the holy will of God it grows clear that to say 'God' at all means to believe in one God, whose power and righteousness are supreme throughout the universe. It might seem then that this belief in one supreme and holy God is a simple and adequate statement of the fundamental truth of all religion, and that into it must be fitted all that we know about Jesus Christ and all that we experience of the influence of the Divine Spirit.

One can understand therefore why objection may be made to speaking of a God who is 'three in one and one in three,' 'God in three Persons, blessed Trinity.' That, if it means anything, seems to mean something very complicated. Attempts to explain it can easily be made to appear foolish. When Dante the poet tried with the utmost reverence to describe the Trinity he dropped from poetry to mathematics and wrote about three circles united in some way that he does not make clear. A modern wit has suggested that the doctrine of the Trinity makes God into a committee. Now it is no sufficient retort to say that the being of God must be veiled in mystery. That is doubtless true, but the point at issue is why precisely this kind of mystery, three in one and one in three. Any satisfying and convincing expositions of the doctrine of the Trinity has to show that it is no superfluous elaboration of theological fancy but is a serious attempt to reach a form of thought about a mystery forced upon our attention by quite definite facts in religious experience.

A clear analogy lies to hand in the acceptance by scientists of Einstein's difficult and complicated theory of relativity in place of Newton's simple law of gravitation. It is a principle of science to use the simplest theory that will fit the facts and to reject an elaborate explanation where a plain one will do. Why then is Einstein's very difficult principle of relativity accepted? Because if all the facts are taken into account, including some very minute measurements no one had considered previously, connected with light, and with the apparent irregular motions of the planet Mercury, this difficult theory seems, in spite of its complications, to be the simplest way possible of accounting for everything. So, while the Trinity may be an idea difficult to comprehend, one may be able to show that it covers more of the truth about God than the bare statement that there is one God can do.

From the New Testament indeed it is plain that the roots of this doctrine are not in philosophical speculation but in Christian experience. It was there as a living faith before it was recognized as a theological proposition. The Jews believed passionately in one God. The first Christians shared that belief, and certainly had no desire to make their religion more complicated. If in their worship and their thinking they reached a faith that was not simply in one God but in one God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, surely the explanation is that they were driven by inescapable realities in their religious life, and that no simpler creed could contain the range and depth of the Christian experience of fellowship with the Divine.

1. Christians from the earliest days of the faith have adored Jesus without any feeling that the praise of Jesus implies any disregard of the supreme reverence due to God the Father. They even pray to Jesus or speak to Him as they would to God, as when Stephen the martyr said, dying, 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit' and when John says, 'Even so, come, Lord Jesus.' It is this that makes us speak of the divinity of our Lord.

Some unfortunately have gone on to use phrases like that in the hymn which says 'Jesus is God,' or of the theological journalist who tried to catch attention by calling the Crucifixion 'the execution of God.' Such phrases do not ring true, and they are not New Testament language. The Scriptures do not say 'Jesus is God,' but that Jesus is 'the Son of God,' and, distinguishing Him from other men, 'the only-begotten Son of God.' Jesus Himself believed in one God, and called Him 'Father, Lord of heaven and earth.' When He prayed to God He was not praying to Himself, He was asking as a man does for heavenly help. Have we then to say that Jesus was in some way different from God, worthy of the highest praise, and yet not quite God in the same sense as God the Father and Creator? It may seem to be so.

Yet, on the other hand, where does this difference lie? It cannot mean that God is greater than Jesus; for when one wishes to say the biggest thing that can be said about God, it is said by calling God 'the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.' That is a nobler truth about God than that He made sun, moon, and stars. 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' If Jesus reveals fully the glory of God it means that His glory is as great as that of God. So in His teaching Jesus never speaks in such terms as 'God will lead us to His truth, and this is what I think it is.' He speaks with entire assurance, as one who knows from the inside that what He says is God's truth. And when we look at Christ's dying love we do not say God's love must be as great or greater, we say, there is God's own love in action.

So how are we to distinguish and yet not make a difference between Jesus and God? Before making any difficulty about the matter it is well to note the plain fact that this has been done by simple Christian people from the beginning. It was common practice in thought and worship before there was any doctrine on the subject. What the doctrine of the Trinity does is to offer a

theological formula which will explain or cover this practice.

The doctrine declares that Jesus, the Son of God, is, in a way that we are aware of though we may not fully understand it, one with the Father. How can two persons be one? However closely they are united, as in a perfect marriage or partnership, they remain two, their individualities enhanced rather than blurred by the association. On the other hand if individualities are merged, as in a limited company, their personalities are lost—as the saying runs, a corporation has no soul or conscience. If we could imagine a unity that would be as complete as that of a corporation and at the same time retain and preserve the personality of each member we might be able to begin to comprehend something of the mystery of the being of God.

There are those who dislike any element of mystery in religion. But a doctrine of God that left no room for mystery might well for that very reason be suspected to be shallow and inadequate. St. John Ervine the dramatist, wrote in a letter to Mrs. Burnett Smith, 'I believe that there is no hope for the Christian religion, which is, I think, the only vital religion in the world, until the doctrine of the divinity of Christ is abandoned. . . . I can understand the *man* Jesus and hope in some measure to resemble him, but I cannot understand the *god* Jesus and I have no hope of being able to resemble him.' Notice the stress on what he can and cannot understand. The value of the doctrine of the Trinity is just that it recognizes that there is more in Jesus than we can quite understand. While we rejoice in the fact that He is one of us, a man, our brother, it is also our comforting assurance that He is not, like us, struggling to reach toward God and His truth but that He is here as the revelation of the very heart and mind of God. He represents ideal humanity to God, but it is as true to say that He represents God His Father to mankind. There will be little left of the vitality of the Christian religion where this is not recognized. And any one who does recognize this should be heartily willing, even though it be with a sense of the profound difficulty of such a formula, to subscribe to the doctrine of the Trinity. Can he deny it without belittling his own deepest thought and feeling about Jesus Christ?

2. Christians believe in the Holy Spirit. When Paul asks to be 'strengthened with power through his Spirit in the inward man' he is clearly praying to be influenced by God in a special way.

A man may feel that God controls or influences him from without. He knows the moral law and in fear resolves to keep it. He admires the example of Jesus and decides to imitate it. So with his human freedom and independence a man may yield to Divine influence.

But is that a sufficient account of the life of a religious man, that he looks up to what is above him and beyond him, and is impressed, and guided? Some might say so, but with the Christian experience comes the knowledge that God does not influence men only from without, as One standing over and apart from them, God also works from within, making His presence felt within the human soul, so that man is possessed or inspired by God. The New Testament describes this as 'having the spirit of Christ,' or having 'Christ in the heart,' or being filled with the Holy Spirit. So when a Christian man finds the strength and will to do something right and good, he does not take credit for it, as if he had done it by his own force of character, he says he was moved and enabled by the Holy Spirit. It was God within him, Christ dwelling in him. God was really there in his heart.

Yet how can God, the Lord of heaven and earth, the Creator of all, be present in the soul of one man, inside of him, behind his thoughts, sharing his will? It seems an impossible idea unless we can say that there is also a Holy Spirit, the very reality of God, moving into and within the spirits of men. The one God is thus Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

An effort to make this clearer has been made by adding to God the words 'three in one and one in three.' What makes such attempts at explanation of little use is that they involve either an effort to describe what it feels like to be God, or an effort to examine God as a strange phenomenon. Such approaches to the subject quickly pass either into subtle philosophy or irreverence. What as Christians we can and must do is to realize that our experience being what it is, we cannot praise God truly as we ought unless we praise Him as the Father, the Creator, the Lord over all; and also as the Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, a man our brother, in whose face we see the Father; and also as the Holy Spirit, the indwelling presence of God Himself. Our experience of God, our knowledge of Him, our fellowship with Him is in all these ways equally real. And they are not rival or clashing experiences. They are so interconnected and interwoven that they amount to one rich experience. The only way to account for this is to say that in some way of which we are aware though its definition is beyond our powers, the One God, is not simply One. There is a mystery in His very nature and being, so that He is Father, Son and Holy Spirit, One God.

First Sunday after Trinity.

Where Words Break Down.

By the Reverend T. D. Stewart Brown, M.A., South Leith.

'The unsearchable riches of Christ.'—Eph 3^{8}.
'The manifold wisdom of God.'—Eph 3^{10}.
'Love . . . which passeth knowledge.'—Eph 3^{19}.
'Power above all we ask or think.'—Eph 3^{20}.

In a famous essay on Wordsworth, his friend De Quincey indicates one interesting aspect of the poet's career. 'At measured intervals throughout the long sequence of his life,' he tells us, 'a regular succession of windfalls descended upon him to sustain his expenditure with the growing claims upon his purse.' These windfalls De Quincey describes in detail—a legacy which the poet prudently turned into an annuity, the repayment of a forgotten debt, another legacy, and, finally,

a well-paid appointment. The essayist pictures for us the poet making his way through the years, and always, just when the need arose, there came with it plentiful provision.

It is that kind of experience in the spiritual realm of which the writer to the Ephesians speaks, an experience which St. John's Gospel sums up as indeed a whole series of 'windfalls'—'grace piled upon grace.' Of course the whole New Testament is the record of what inexhaustible resources men of all sorts and conditions found in Jesus Christ. But let us content ourselves by looking only at this one chapter, and noting therein some of the 'windfalls' into which, says the Apostle, the Christian man has come.

1. *The Unsearchable Riches of Christ.* This is a phrase which has baffled the translators. 'The fathomless wealth of Christ,' Moffatt puts it; and Dr. Weymouth has it 'the exhaustless wealth of Christ.' Literally, the Greek word is 'that which cannot be measured out with the foot.' The picture that it brings to mind is of a young Greek or Roman who has just come into a fortune, in these days almost certainly in the form of land. So he sets himself to 'ride the marches,' to find out just how far his new patrimony extends. On he goes, acre after acre, mile after mile, day after day, until at last he calls a halt and cries: Why, the thing is endless; I could go on for all the rest of my days, and never reach the boundary! . . . 'The unsearchable riches of Christ.'

It was the experience of the first disciples. Day after day, as they lived with Him, followed Him, watched Him meeting difficulties, grappling with situations, conquering circumstances, displaying always a courage, a wisdom, a tact, a compassion, a yearning zeal for men, that exhausted every category of their thought to describe, it was forced in upon them that here was the Lord of all life. So, too, with these Christians to whom Paul writes. All of them had experienced something of the strange compelling power of the Risen Christ in their own lives, curbing in them hatred, and fear, and suspicion, and greed, and cruelty, and uncleanness of thought and act; until at last they had become convinced that there was nothing that He couldn't do for them and with them and in them, and they cried, as Paul cried: O, the unscarchable riches of Christ! If, for fear, He has given us courage; if for despair He has given us hope; if for corruption and moral rottenness He has given us righteousness and peace; if for what was death and the very depths of death He has given us life eternal—if He has done all that for us, then there are simply no limits to what He can do for any one who will trust Him fully.

2. *The Manifold Wisdom of God.* I remember how, as students, we used to sit poring over a microscope in the geology laboratory, gazing at a slide of some rock specimen, showing the crystals of its many components under polarized light. There was the sparkling green of the olivine, the dark brown of the hornblende, the flashing red of the hæmatite, the shining silver of the felspar. And when we came upon a specimen more particularly diverse in its chemical composition and specially variegated in its colouring we learned to call it *poikilitic*. That is St. Paul's very word—the poikilitic wisdom of God, and to it he tacks on a prefix, and calls it the poly-poikilitic, the much variegated, the scintillating, iridescent, multi-multi-coloured wisdom of God.

And by that he seems to be trying to say two things. First, that this wisdom of God is so diverse that there is no son of woman, whatever his temperament, however peculiar his outlook, however unusual his character, for whom God's wisdom cannot and will not work and plan. And, second, that there is no circumstance of human life, no narrow defile of experience, no desperate strait of fortune, out of which this never-out-manœuvred wisdom of God cannot and will not lead him safely. The Church's own story was to be a demonstration of it. Remember, Paul was writing to men who very soon might have to face unfriended all the might and scorn of pagan Rome. How were they to hold on in the darkness of the approaching persecutions, how were they to overcome by the mere word of their testimony, unless somehow there could be born in them the unflinching conviction that, behind the seeming circumstance, God was planning for them with a wisdom which could never be foiled or circumvented? So Paul writes to them his assurance that, no matter who we are, despite all the idiosyncracies of our own characters, in the teeth of every possible entail of heredity, in the face of the pressure of whatever surrounding circumstances, this God of ours, in the infinite variety of His wisdom, will save us.

3. *Love Which Passeth Knowledge.* The love, mark you, comes after the wisdom; for always, behind and beyond the wisdom lies a love that outstrips, overleaps, all our human ken, that remains always beyond the bounds of our mere human comprehension. Not just beyond our intellectual grasp. Surely God's love must always be of a quality which cannot be assessed by our human system of weights and measures. Rather what Paul here means is that this love of God's that motivates and prompts all His variegated wisdom in the ordering of our lives is of such a quality, is so infinite in its extent, that there is no plumbing of its deeps or scaling of its heights.

When Nansen, the great Arctic explorer, came to take soundings one day in the Frozen North, he bored as usual through the ice and let down his sounding line. Down and down it went, but did not find the bottom. Another line was added, and yet another, until all the lines in the ship were tied together and let down—and even then they failed to reach the ocean bed. And that night, when Nansen came to make his records for the day, this is what he wrote: '3500 fathoms—and deeper than that!' That is what Paul means by this love that passeth knowledge. You can never reach its limits; for its height is the roof of the highest heaven, and its length is the length of time itself, and from eternity to eternity; its breadth is the breadth of the whole world of needy men; and its depth is the deep of the human heart—and deeper than that!

4. *A Power Above All We Ask or Think.* But at the thought of such sovereign power the Apostle's mind seems to reel, and his speech becomes confounded. Words fail even this most eloquent of men, writing in the most highly inflected language of the ancient world, as he tries to commit to his parchment the things that with the eye of his faith he sees. He heaps word on word, idea upon idea, in a vain attempt to utter all he knows. It is a power, he says, which is able to do; able to do above what we ask; abundantly above what we ask; exceeding abundantly above what we ask; and, then, in a last despair of words, he adds: Yes, able to do exceeding abundantly above all we ask—or even think! And with that, all our human thought breaks down, and heart and mind and soul bow in revering silence before the wealth of grace and infinite resource of wisdom, before the unbounded, unrestrained love and all-prevailing power of Him who is the glorious Author of it all, and in whose heart of love it all at first took birth and form.

5. *But*—the secret of Paul's life was this: that, knowing this mystery of godliness, envisaging in his mind something of the wonder of this of which he has been speaking, he was not content to leave it all in the realm of thought alone. These glowing phrases, these vaulting ideas, these wide vistas of holy imagination, are a transcript from his own experience. It was fact and action in his own life and character before ever it found its way to his manuscript. 'I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me,' he writes in another place; through this Christ of the unsearchable riches, of the manifold wisdom, of the surpassing love and infinite power. And if Paul could, why not you and me? It is the same Christ that is our Christ; He does not change as we change. Not a faint voice across the centuries, but a living Presence with us now. 'He is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever'; the same amid all the complexities of the modern mind, the same for us too amid all the uncertainties of the post-war world. As blind George Matheson wrote when the darkness closed in about him: 'Son of Man, whenever I doubt of life, I think of Thee. Thou never growest old to me. Last century is old, last year is old, last season is an obsolete fashion: but Thou art not obsolete. Thou art abreast of all the centuries; nay, Thou goest before them like a star. I have never come up with Thee, modern as I am.'

'If you become His man,' so St. Brendan assured King Brude, 'you will stumble on wonder upon wonder—and every wonder true.'

The Wrath of God.

By the Reverend R. P. C. Hanson, B.D., Banbridge, Co. Down.

It is impossible to conceal the fact that the whole Bible speaks to us of the wrath of God. It has been for a long time the prevailing tendency to avoid the subject of God's wrath on the grounds that the idea of God displaying wrath was one of the less inspired themes in the Old Testament and is for the Christian ironed out by the generous gospel of love revealed in the New Testament. But the wrath of God *does* appear in the New Testament and is inseparable from the gospel to be found in its pages. We cannot even claim that the idea of God's wrath in the New Testament is just one of those Hebraic ideas which so regrettably linger on in much of St. Paul's thought, because the idea appears unmistakably in our Lord's parables of judgment, under such symbols as Everlasting Fire, Outer Darkness, and the Shut Door.

In the Old Testament we find the conception of God's wrath quite directly and crudely put beside that of His love without explanation or modification. In the 63rd chapter of Isaiah, for instance, we find some of the most terrible verses in the Bible: (*vv.*[1-6]) 'Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah? this that is glorious in his apparel, marching in the greatness of his strength? I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save. Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the winefat? I have trodden the winepress alone; and of the peoples there was no man with me; yea, I trod them in mine anger, and trampled them in my fury; and their lifeblood is sprinkled upon my garments, and I have stained all my raiment. For the day of vengeance was in mine heart, and the year of my redeemed is come. And I looked, and there was none to help; and I wondered that there was none to uphold; therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me; and my fury, it upheld me. And I trod down the peoples in mine anger, and made them drunk in my fury, and I poured out their lifeblood on the earth.' Here is a gruesome picture of God pursuing His enemies with what we can only call a vindictive fury. But the very next verse presents the love of God: (*vv.*[7-9]) 'I will make mention of the lovingkindnesses of the Lord, and the praises of the Lord, according to all that the Lord hath bestowed on us. . . . For he said, Surely, they are my people, children

that will not deal falsely ; so he was their saviour. In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them : in his love and in his pity he redeemed them ; and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old.'

Now the love of God as presented in this passage is of course repeated and expanded in the New Testament, but we must face the fact that the wrath of God is not dropped altogether there either. The very earliest document in the New Testament (1 Thessalonians) mentions 'the wrath to come' (1^{10}), and says of the Jews, 'but the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost' (2^{16}). Again, 2 Thessalonians speaks of God's wrath as revealed in Christ in terms not unreminiscent of Isaiah 63 : 'at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of his power in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus ; who shall suffer punishment, even eternal destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his might . . .' (1^{7-9}). Again, the Epistle to the Romans speaks of the wrath of God several times, especially (as we shall see) in the first chapter ; but, in accordance with the more thoughtful tone of the whole letter, it does so in more theological and less pictorial terms than do the Thessalonian Epistles. Anyway, here is the wrath, firmly embedded in the New Testament. What are we to make of it ?

If we are to understand God's wrath we must first try to understand God's love. God's love is not the love of an 'unmoved mover,' an intellectual Greek deity, but it is the love of a personal God and a holy God. God's love is a jealous love, an absorbing, engrossing love, in the best sense of the word an intolerant love. Moreover, when God loves us, the claim which that love makes upon us is totally unlike the claim which anybody else's love makes on us. God alone has the absolute, supreme, irrefutable right upon our allegiance ; it is wrong for us to criticize or argue about God's right to our allegiance, and this is so just because He is God, because when He chooses to enter our lives with His demands upon us, it is no ordinary person whose credentials we can examine, whose authority we can question, but it is God Himself who accosts us, our Creator, our Redeemer, before whom we have of ourselves no status, no ground left for arguing : 'Who hath directed the spirit of the Lord, or being his counsellor hath taught him ? With whom took he counsel, and who instructed him, and taught him in the path of judgment, and taught him knowledge, and showed to him the way of understanding ?' . . . 'But how can man be just with God ? If he be pleased to contend with him, he cannot answer him one of a thousand.' . . . 'Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God ? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why didst thou make me thus ?' . . . 'O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God ! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out ! For who hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been his counsellor ? or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again ?'

Therefore when such a God loves, as He does, with a seeking, determined love, it must also be for man an *inescapable* love ; that is to say, whatever effect it has upon him, it cannot just pass by him leaving him unaffected. If man's freewill is to be preserved—and he would cease to be man if it were not—he must have the power of rejecting God's love if he chooses ; but if God's love is to be the love of God, and not the love of some other, less important person, man cannot be left unaffected by the rejection of such a love. If man rejects God's love he must fall under God's wrath, just because it is God who is offering him this love. God's wrath guarantees that God's love really is a serious love, the love of a righteous and a holy God, the love of a God whose love is inescapable. Man must encounter that love ; if he accepts it, in the form of love ; if he rejects it, in the form of wrath.

We might take two analogies to help us to understand this point. Suppose that a king offers his hand in marriage to a commoner and she rejects his offer. She has had liberty to choose ; but she could not be unaffected by the rejection of such an offer. Some centuries ago it might have cost her her life ; to-day it would probably cost her at least her privacy. The very fact that it was no ordinary person, but a king, who made the offer has fundamentally changed her status. Another analogy can be provided if we imagine a very powerful modern state offering an alliance to a smaller neighbouring state. If the smaller state rejects the alliance its relations with the greater neighbour cannot remain the same as they were before the offer ; indeed its whole attitude to international politics must be altered by the rejection, just because the state which offered the alliance is no ordinary one, but a great, and possibly menacing, power. Similarly, when God offers us His love, even if we reject that love our whole status is profoundly affected, and it is of God's very nature that this should be so. Our relation to God when we have rejected His love is described by the Bible as living 'under the wrath of God.'

Now observe that this is a very different conception from the idea of God's wrath as preached by those who to-day do take the Scriptural

doctrine of the wrath of God seriously. The popular idea of God's wrath (where it exists at all) presents it as a force or impulse within God's nature running parallel to and checking or balancing God's love. We are told (sometimes from rather blatant posters which break out like a rash over the streets of our towns) that God's love will go a certain distance and endure for a certain time, but that soon a limit to this will be imposed by the necessity of God having regard to His justice, or wrath. Or it is said that God's justice, or wrath, would go to terrible lengths did not His love interpose. This is of course a perverted and unacceptable doctrine, because it supposes that there exist within the divine nature two contrary impulses checking and reacting upon each other. In the conception of the relation between God's wrath and God's love outlined in this essay, however, this unpleasant dichotomy is done away with. God's wrath is the other side of God's love, like the obverse of a coin stamped on only one side; it is God's love seen in relation to one who has rejected God's love; and without God's wrath His love would be the love of a god who was unworthy to be the Creator and Ruler and Redeemer and holy and wise Father of the universe.

It is significant that what I have called the popular idea of God's wrath (that is, of wrath as an impulse checking or balancing love) is undoubtedly to be found in the Old Testament. This is not surprising, because the Old Testament gives us, so to speak, the ingredients of the New Testament doctrine of God's love and God's wrath, without bringing them into true relation with one another. We find exactly the same true of its doctrine of God's transcendence and His immanence, and of vicarious suffering and of sacrifice. The doctrines are there, but, so to speak, out of focus; they find their focus in the New Testament. So we find (as we have seen) in the Old Testament mention of God's love, and parallel with it, but not truly related to it, mention of God's wrath. In the New Testament the true relation is fully revealed. Here God's love is revealed as a *suffering* love, and it is obvious at once that suffering love and vindictive anger are entirely inconsistent with one another; we cannot attribute vindictive anger to God, and I do not believe that the New Testament anywhere does attribute this to Him. The ἐκδίκησιν of 2 Th 1[8] need not mean anything more than 'just retribution.' But the conception of God's wrath outlined above is, I believe, quite consistent with the belief even in God's suffering love, indeed such a conception of God's love demands a belief in God's wrath to give it full significance. When God's final and inescapable demand meets man, it meets him in the form—most amazing but most true—of God's Son hanging upon a Cross. God's love revealed in the Crucifixion of Christ is a suffering love, but it is still an inescapable love, a love which brings judgment.

There is one further point which must be raised in connexion with the wrath of God. The treatment of wrath in the Epistle to the Romans suggests that God's wrath is not so much a passion as a relation or condition into which men bring themselves by their attitude towards God. In his description of those who were under the wrath of God in Romans 1, St. Paul three times uses the phrase 'gave them up' (παρέδωκεν) of God's activity; it is reminiscent of Psalm 81:

> 'He gave them up to their own hearts' lusts
> And let them follow their own imaginations,'

and it suggests that wrath is no more than a condition of separation from God where the fatal consequences of such a state work themselves inexorably out without any further intervention from God. This, indeed, is the view which Professor C. H. Dodd takes of Paul's conception of wrath, in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Is God's wrath no more than this? I am strongly inclined to suspect Professor Dodd upon this occasion of wishful thinking. Not only does the Old Testament give us a much stronger doctrine of God's wrath than this, but the wrath as described in Thessalonians, in our Lord's parables of judgment and in the Revelation of St. John the Divine is something more than a state of alienation from God. If we are to conceive of God's love as a seeking, inescapable love, the love of the divine Vindicator bringing His people out of Exile, of the divine Shepherd seeking His lost sheep, of the divine Bridegroom coming down out of Heaven to seek, and even to die for, His bride, must we not also see something corresponding to this *seeking* quality in God's wrath? Surely God does not leave people alone; He seeks them even while they are under wrath, through the medium, through the relation of wrath; for wrath will turn to love as soon as the sinner turns again to God. Wrath is only love in another relation. God's wrath and God's love must never be separated in our thought, because—God is truly God.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The Grammar of the Ras Shamra Texts. The important texts from Ras Shamra have commanded wide and intensive study, though there is often great divergence in their interpretation. Already they have begun to take their place in examination syllabuses, and students will welcome the provision of precise tools for their study. For grammars and lexicons are indispensable tools, though they naturally rest—and especially the lexicons—on interpretation. Two such tools, published on the Continent during the War, are now available to students. The first is a general treatment of Ugaritic Grammar, written by an American scholar in English and published in Rome,[1] while the second is a very full study of the verb in Ugaritic, written by a Danish scholar in German.[2]

The writer of the former of these works is Cyrus H. Gordon, who belongs to the Albright School of interpretation of the texts. He has given a systematic account of the morphology of the language, together with a chapter on the poetic structure of the texts. Since most of them are poetic, this chapter is of no little interest. It demonstrates a similarity of form—with parallelism and rhythm of significant idea rather than of syllable—to what we find in the Old Testament. There is a brief chapter on the classification of the language of the texts, and a glossary of the texts so far published. That the glossary presents the views of the School to which the writer belongs is natural, and there are many words which other interpreters translate differently. But that is inevitable in such a work, and in no way detracts from its importance as a handbook for the student. For he needs to gain some facility in reading the texts before he can appreciate the discussions on the more important *cruces interpretum* which they contain. Some treatment of the syntax of the texts might have been expected, but for that the student must turn to an article by Brockelmann in *Orientalia*,[3] which was written expressly to supplement Gordon's book.

The writer of the other book is E. Hammershaimb, who is a Professor in the University of Aarhus, which claims to be the youngest university in the world. Though his work deals only with the verb, and therefore with but a fraction of the field of Gordon's, it is equal in volume to Gordon's book. It therefore provides an exhaustive discussion of the verbal forms, and commendably gives paradigms at the end of the volume—a feature Gordon's work unfortunately lacks. On some important questions that have been disputed amongst scholars, Hammershaimb ranges himself with Gordon. As a supplement to the work of Gordon the student will find his study of the utmost value, but both books are quite indispensable to every serious student of the texts.[4]

Zephaniah. The Swedish scholar Gillis Gerleman published in 1942 an elaborate and detailed study of the book of Zephaniah,[5] which found its inspiration in the work of Nyberg and Lindblom. About half of Gerleman's work consists of a careful study of the Hebrew text of this little book with the texts presupposed by the Septuagint, Syriac and Vulgate versions. To a lesser extent some of the other versions, including the Targum and the Ethiopic, are made use of. Here we have sound and judicious work, and Gerleman has assembled a large amount of material for the textual criticism of Zephaniah.

Following the study of the text there is a translation of the text adopted, and then valuable chapters on each of the three principal versions studied. In the chapter on the Septuagint Gerleman takes the opportunity to express his dissent from the views of Sperber, who denies that there was a single prototype of the Septuagint. He thinks the Hebrew text used by the translator of the Septuagint was not identical with the present Massoretic text, but was closely similar to it. The text presupposed by the Syriac rendering was even nearer to the Massoretic text.

The last chapter deals with the origin and the thought of the Book of Zephaniah. It is commonly thought that it originated at the time of the Scythian peril with which the call of Jeremiah is associated. Gerleman thinks this is entirely without foundation. The Scythian peril is unreferred to in the historical books of the Old Testament, and he does not think it is relevant to the discussion of either Jeremiah or Zephaniah.

The somewhat overworked cultic prophets figure not a little in Gerleman's discussion. The Book of Deuteronomy is attributed to the cult-prophets of the Jerusalem Temple, and Zephaniah

[1] *Ugaritic Grammar: The Present Status of the Linguistic Study of the Semitic Alphabetic Texts from Ras Shamra*, by C. H. Gordon (1940; Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Rome).

[2] *Das Verbum im Dialekt von Ras Schamra: eine morphologische und syntaktische Untersuchung des Verbums in den alphabetischen Keilschrifttexten aus dem alten Ugarit*, by E. Hammershaimb (1941; Munksgaard, Copenhagen).

[3] 'Zur Syntax der Sprache von Ugarit,' in *Orientalia*, x. [1941], 223–240.

[4] Mention may here be made of an invaluable brief survey of the bearing of the Ras Shamra texts on the Old Testament, from a linguistic, literary, historical, and religious standpoint, published by W. Baumgartner in 1940 and 1941 ('Ras Schamra und das Alte Testament,' *Theologische Rundschau*, xii. [1940], 163–188; xiii. [1941], 1–20, 85–102, 157–183). No student of the texts should miss this survey, if only because of its wide acquaintance with the literature on the subject.

[5] *Zephanja textkritisch und literarisch untersucht* (Gleerup, Lund).

is also brought into close association with them. Nevertheless Zephaniah is believed to have been largely a reflector of the influence of Isaiah, and to have stood over against the Deuteronomic circles in being a prophet of disaster. Yet he was influenced by the nationalistic ideas of his day, and is not to be set so sharply over against Deuteronomy as one might think. For Zephaniah was nearer to the prophets of weal—who are identified with the cultic prophets—than the superficial might suppose, in that the disaster was to be the prelude to the restoration of the purified nation. The attribution of Deuteronomy to the Jerusalem cult-prophets seems unconvincing, since it leaves unaccounted for the successful opposition to the Deuteronomic provision that the country Levites might come to the single legitimate shrine to sacrifice there. The Jerusalem staff would appear to have provided that opposition, and can scarcely be credited with the demand for that which they resisted. Despite occasional points of difference this book is to be warmly commended as an important and detailed discussion of the text and problems of the book of Zephaniah.

Pre-Massoretic Hebrew Grammar. The first book published in Germany during the War to reach my hands was written by a Danish scholar, Einar Brønno, and it consists of studies on Hebrew morphology and vocalization as revealed in Origen's transliterations from Hebrew in the second column of the Hexapla, of which fragments were found in 1894 by Cardinal Mercati on a palimpsest.[1] The fragments contain the transscription of eleven psalms, and contain about one thousand words, of which eight hundred are different. On the basis of these words Brønno constructs a complete Hebrew Grammar.

Already earlier he had published some shorter studies in this field,[2] but now we have in the present work a volume of nearly five hundred pages containing an exhaustive discussion of all the material so far available. Its importance is obvious, since it goes back so far behind the work of the Massoretes, and gives us some insight into the pronunciation of the language much nearer the time when the books of the Old Testament were written. Especially important is the evidence on the vocalization, since it antedates the whole system of the Massoretic vowels. The texts contain a total of about two thousand five hundred Hebrew vowels in transliteration, and to these Brønno devotes about half of his work. An appendix is devoted to a critical discussion of a long article of Sperber's on 'Hebrew based upon Greek and Latin Transliterations,'[3] but Brønno had had no opportunity to see another long article of Sperber's which appeared in America at about the same time as his own book appeared in Germany.[4]

It is unlikely that the material here studied will affect the ordinary students' grammars of Hebrew, since the Massoretic text must continue to be the basis of their study and hence the Massoretes' grammar must be their introduction to it. But Brønno has made a first-class contribution to the study of the history of the Hebrew language.

The Cultic Cry in the Old Testament. Professor P. Humbert has published a characteristically thorough study of all the occurrences in the Old Testament of the word *Teru'a* and its associated verb.[5] Previous writers and lexicographers have regarded the word as having a double sense, and used of a vocal or instrumental sound, and as having reference to war and to the Temple liturgy. Humbert studies all the passages where the word is found, in relation to both their date and their significance. He shows first of all that the term denotes a collective sound, and then that it was primarily a vocal sound. There are a few passages where he does not claim that an instrumental sound is excluded, but these are late passages, and even here there is nothing to authorize any categorical affirmation that the word *teru'a* ever consisted of an essentially and solely instrumental rite.

In the pre-exilic period the *teru'a* was a cultic war-cry, or a cry used in the ritual of the enthronement of Yahweh. In both cases the cultic element in its significance must be remembered. War was a sacred institution, and the cry with which Israel went into battle was of religious significance. It is of interest to note that of the eighty-one occurrences of the cognate verbal and nominal forms studied, only three use the term *teru'a* of non-Iraelites, and on examination none of these is found to yield any solid reason to doubt that the *teru'a* is a specifically Yahwistic rite.

Humbert notes the absence of the term from proto-Isaiah and also from Deuteronomy. In both cases he offers an explanation. Isaiah is believed to have observed a disdainful silence towards a rite whose character seemed to him unworthy of the thrice holy God, and moreover its association with the monarchy—the renewal of the king's powers is believed to have been effected in the ritual of the enthronement of Yahweh—brought it into disfavour with a prophet who thought little of the contemporary Judaean monarchy and a lawgiver who sought to limit the power of the king.

The survival of the term in the post-exilic period Humbert ascribes to its transformation of meaning. For here it became increasingly associated with the Temple cultus, and lost its more

[1] *Studien über hebräische Morphologie und Vokalismus auf Grundlage der Mercatischen Fragmente der zweiten Kolumne der Hexapla des Origenes* (1943; Brockhaus, Leipzig).

[2] 'Some Nominal Types in the Septuagint: contributions to pre-Massoretic Hebrew Grammar,' in *Classica et Mediaevalia*, iii. [1940], 180–213; and 'Einige Namentypen der Septuaginta: zur historischen Grammatik des Hebräischen,' in *Acta Orientalia*, xix. 33–64.

[3] *Hebrew Union College Annual*, xii.–xiii. 103–274.

[4] 'Hebrew Grammar: A New Approach,' in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, lxii. [1943], 137–262.

[5] *La 'Terou'a': anaylse d'un rite biblique* (1946; University Press, Neuchâtel).

questionable associations for a more predominantly spiritual meaning. While not everything in Humbert's monograph will be accepted by all readers, his work is a model of what such work should be, and he has given us an important study of the development of the meaning of this term within the Old Testament period.

The Body of Christ. A thorough study of the concept of the Body of Christ in the Pauline Epistles was published in Sweden in 1942, written in German by Ernst Percy.[1] The purpose of the study was to inquire whether there are differences in the concept in the major Epistles, Romans, and 1 Corinthians on the one hand, and the Epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians on the other hand. Hence the relevant passages in the former and the latter are separately examined.

The author rejects the view that in Romans and in 1 Corinthians the expression σῶμα Χριστοῦ is but the collective expression for the community whose members are individually indwelt by the spirit of Christ. He studies the use of the expression ἐν Χριστῷ, and shows that it is rooted in the conception of redemption through the Cross, which entails the identification of the believer with Christ in His death and resurrection. Hence the σῶμα Χριστοῦ is not the aggregation of individuals, each of whom is a body of Christ, but the community of those who have been integrated into Christ. It is not a collection of units, but a single organism, whose parts are integrated into one another in their integration into Christ. Only the community of believers is the Body of Christ. In support of this Percy cites 1 Co 10[17], which he renders: 'Because there is one bread, we, who are many, are one body, for we all partake of the one bread.'[2]

In the Epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians Christ is conceived as the head of the body. This does not mean, however, that He is thought of as but a part of the body, one only of its members. The body has no meaning without the head, any more than the head has without the body, and the difference of expression here does not mean a difference of fundamental conception. It is the head that controls and gives organic unity to the body. Hence, Percy concludes, while the standpoint differs in these Epistles, the concept does not. The thought is throughout Pauline, and is of the believers as the Body of Christ, and of Christ as both Lord and source of life of this one Body.

The argument throughout is close and acute, and the study is to be commended, though the present writer is not wholly persuaded at all points. Without weakening the recognition of the social nature of the Body of Christ, he would recognize more fully the individual nature of Christ's indwelling. In reaction from the excessive individualism of an earlier day, care is needed to avoid over-emphasis on the social side of the truth, whereas both sides have to be maintained in an unresolved tension. We have an individual and direct as well as a corporate and Church-mediated relation with Christ. Yet despite his slightly stronger emphasis on the individual side of truth, the reviewer would commend this very stimulating study.

H. H. ROWLEY.

Manchester.

[1] *Der Leib Christi* (σῶμα Χριστοῦ) *in den Paulinischen Homologumena und Antilegomena* (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, N.F. Avd. 1, Bd. 38, Nr. 1) (1942; Gleerup, Lund).

[2] This is closely similar to Goodspeed's rendering: 'Because there is one loaf, we, many as we are, are one body, for we all share the one loaf.'

Contributions and Comments.

Lead us not into temptation But . . .

THE Lord's Prayer is so profound that nineteen hundred years of scholarship and devotion have not yet plumbed its depths to the full. And at the same time with one exception so simple that the least learned soul can readily make it his own and model all his praying upon it.

The one exception has been frequently noted: 'Lead us not into temptation.'

There are two main difficulties in these words. (1) Is God likely to lead us into temptation? If not, why does our Lord give the words this honoured place? (2) Is it right (or sensible) to ask God to refrain from doing something?

(1) The first difficulty disappears when you notice that the word temptation in the Lord's Prayer is a translation of the Greek word *peirasmos*; and that the verb *peirazo* is translated in our A.V. sometimes as 'tempt' and sometimes as 'try'—in Rev 3[10] you get both. The same is true of the Hebrew *nasah* in the Old Testament—for example, Gn 22[1], 'God did tempt Abraham' (cf. Heb 11[17], 'Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac'), and 2 Ch 32[31], 'God left him, to try him, that he might know all that was in his heart.'

Nasah and *peirazo* each have the sense of probing, searching for weak places. The use of the English word 'test' in every case is illuminating. 'God tested Abraham.' 'Thou shalt not test the Lord thy God' (Mt 4[7]). 'God will not let you be tested above your powers, but will enable you to stand the test' (1 Co 10[13]). 'Thou hast tested them . . . and found them liars' (Rev 2[2]).

Is God likely to lead us into testing experiences? Of course He is. In the wilderness our Lord was tested by the devil; but it was the Spirit who 'led' Him there, for that very purpose. Machinery has to be tested from time to time. An aeroplane,

a ship, a car, must have a 'trial trip' before it goes into service—and the trial trip is more severe than anything it will have to stand in the ordinary way. Any man has his knowledge, his skill, tested before he is given a job.

Certainly God 'leads us into temptation,' again and again—it is a necessary part of the making of a man, and we must count it all joy, knowing that this testing of our faith produces endurance and makes us perfect, wanting nothing (Ja 1^{2-6}).

(2) This brings us right up against the second difficulty. And it is much more formidable than the first. If it is God's will to subject us to tests, why does our Lord teach us to ask God not to do it?

But—does He?

To begin with, it would seem to be against all that we understand of Christian prayer to ask God *not* to do anything. Christian prayer is wholly a process of getting our wills into line with God's will. Any prayer that is not that is not Christian. 'This is the confidence that we have in him, that, if we ask any thing *according to his will*, he heareth us' (1 Jn 5^{14}). 'If ye shall ask any thing *in my name*' (*i.e.*, 'in accordance with My nature,' 'the sort of thing that I would ask Myself'), 'I will do it' (Jn 14^{14}). This is the cause of 'unanswered' prayer; 'ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss,' for your own pleasure (Ja 4^{3}).

What God does is always God's will. Otherwise He would not do it. So we cannot rightly ask Him not to do anything, since that would be opposing our will to His. It follows that our Lord cannot be teaching us to ask that we should not be led into temptation. Then what is He teaching us?

It is here suggested that light shines from the word *but*.

(*a*) It makes the words 'Lead . . . evil' one petition—not two.

(*b*) In what sense is it used? Consider our Lord's saying, 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Mt 15^{24}). He is not saying that He was not sent. He was sent—but only (or more particularly?) to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Or again, 'Whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me' (Mk 9^{37}). He is not saying that we do not receive Him. God forbid! He is saying, 'You receive Me indeed, but more, you are receiving Him that sent Me.' One more (there are plenty): Jn 7^{16}: 'My teaching is my own, but what is more important is that it is His that sent Me.'

Green's *Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament* says of this idiom, 'When one of two contrasted statements is intended to qualify the other, it is sometimes forcibly expressed as an actual denial.' May it not be that our Lord teaches us to pray, 'Test us, yes; but above all keep us from coming to harm in the testing'—'Lead us not into temptation without delivering us from evil'?

Will this stand the scrutiny of Greek scholarship? The present writer can only say he has put it to the test of years of daily use—with increasing comfort, satisfaction, and enlightenment.

G. B. Verity.

Kew Gardens, Surrey.

The Number of New Testament Greek Papyrus Fragments.

In the sixth edition of Kirsopp Lake's *Text of the New Testament* published in 1928 no space is given to a treatment of the papyri manuscripts. The term is not found in the index of this compact account of the New Testament Text, but in the lists of New Testament Manuscripts given in Appendix B the list of Greek manuscripts of the Gospels concludes with the item, 'Numerous fragments including papyri.' In the list of manuscripts of the Acts and Catholic Epistles, of the Pauline Epistles and of the Apocalypse no reference is made to a papyrus manuscript.

We have now papyrus material in sufficient amount for Horner to construct a whole New Testament composed of Greek and Sahidic fragments. Some of the Greek papyri because of their early date and the quantity and quality of their material not only compel consideration but are ranked in importance with the great Greek Uncial manuscripts. Some of the papyrus fragments cover the same ground as when eight of them can be used to support or illustrate the most solid of the papyrus documents, namely the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Pauline Epistles.

In 1912 A. Souter gave a list of New Testament Greek papyrus fragments containing fourteen entries. F. G. Kenyon described some in his *Handbook to Textual Criticism* of the same year. A later list in 1913 comprising twenty-three fragments is mentioned by G. Milligan in *The New Testament Documents*; the same scholar in *Here and There Among the Papyri* declares that between thirty and forty have been deciphered and edited and that they are drawn from twelve New Testament books. W. H. P. Hatch edits thirteen from the third century claiming that all the papyrus fragments that can be confidently assigned to the third century are included in the collection. In the seventeen volumes of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri there are thirty New Testament fragments. W. H. Davies writing in 1935 notes that only thirty-five fragments of the New Testament have been published. Among the 157 items from the New Testament that P. L. Hedley has listed, not only papyri are found but also vellum and ostraca appear in his catalogue. The publishing of a detailed list is a desideratum in this branch of New Testament study to enable students to ascertain the area of the ground covered, and whether the roll or the codex form predominates. The whole subject of the papyrus New Testament with its witness to the employment if not the creation of the book instead of the roll for early Christian propaganda has its parallel in the spate of modern translations bringing the scriptures to the people.

Edwin Brady.

Douglas, Isle of Man.

Entre Nous.

The World's Great Scriptures.

One's first pleasant duty is to congratulate the publishers, Messrs. The Macmillan Co., New York, on the form and appearance of their book, *The World's Great Scriptures*, compiled by Lewis Browne ($5.00). It is a fine volume of five hundred and fifty-six pages, beautifully printed, tastefully bound, liberally illustrated, and with an unusually attractive jacket—a first-rate production.

Of the contents one can in some respects speak warmly, if not with the same unqualified enthusiasm. There is much here of value, handily collected together. And wide and diligent reading lies behind the compiling of this book. It is twenty years since Mr. Browne sent out his 'The Believing World,' which, it appears, has been reprinted, in various languages, thirty-seven times. And during these two decades he has been gathering material for this anthology now issued.

He himself apologizes that it does not cover all the religions; that there is nothing representing Jainism, Sikhism, Shintoism, and some lesser fry of American origin. But no reasonable person can expect to have everything from everywhere crowded into a single book. Mr. Browne has built a spacious storehouse, and has packed it with samples of the harvests raised in many lands.

The compiler has his preferences, as who of us has not? Some indication of them is shown by the space that he assigns to each of the living religions. The most is given to his own Judaism; for Mr. Browne has been a Rabbi in places here and there. Unhappily the eighty pages that he allows it are not used to the best advantage, being cluttered up, in part, by second-rate sayings—much the tamest portion of the whole volume. Close behind come Confucianism; then Buddhism and Hinduism side by side. Christianity and Muhammadanism are treated much more cavalierly. While for Zoroastrianism he has little space. And, indeed, noble religion though it be, its sacred books are duller, to most minds, than their rivals. There are things here one is glad to see, like the Tevijja Sutta, far too seldom quoted; and, particularly pleasing, a real place is allowed to Moti, that gracious teacher, too long overlooked, but, at long last, coming into something of his own. And there are other contents which, while welcome, surprise one a little by appearing under this title. The Laws of Hammurabi, for example, or Ptah-hotep. That last is the oldest book that has survived as a whole. Interesting, indeed, for that reason alone, it has a pathos in its origin—for it was the work of a very old man whose son was going wrong, and who left him these directions on how to use his life—and a moving impressiveness in the depth and directness of the directions given, and of the knowledge of man and life that they reveal. But the translation here used is to me less appealing by far than are certain others. In any case, neither of these writings can be classed under the World's Great Scriptures, in the accepted understanding of that term.

On the other hand, as one turns the pages of this volume, one becomes aware of a sense of disappointment, of a sharp feeling that there is something definitely wrong. And, on thinking it out, it appears to arise from the fact that if, as has been hinted, the title chosen is in some respects too limited, in certain others it is quite ridiculously much too wide. Mr. Browne tells us 'I have tried to gather up all that seems to me most vital in the world's holy books, all that is most enlightening in them, and therefore most worth reading.' But he goes on to explain that 'in choosing my selections, however, I have deliberately concentrated "on ethics," quoting few passages of a strictly theological nature.' The fitting title for this book is, on that showing, surely, 'Some Ethical Passages from Some of the World's Great Scriptures, and from certain other Writings.' And the bland assumption that passages of a theological nature are not among 'the most vital' is odd teaching from an adherent of Judaism, and stupid and ignorant talk from any one.

One should have imagined that, in determining what is most vital, he should have been guided by the adherents of the various faiths, and should have concentrated on what has won and held their hearts, and upon which they build, and through which their religion has most helped them. Not so Mr. Browne; with queer enough results.

Take Judaism, for example. There are here, of course, the Ten Commandments, and the great finding in Micah. But, in the main, he chooses very subsidiary things. The self-revelation of God is ignored. The discovery of the individual in Jeremiah and Ezekiel gets no mention. The chapters in Isaiah that haunt the memory are not here. Of the Psalms we are given the twenty-third; but with it only the first, the fifteenth, the fifty-fourth, the hundred and first, and the hundred and thirty-third—a simply preposterous choice.

Or take Christianity. There is only one quotation from the Fourth Gospel—where Christ wrote on the ground. And all the rest is blank. No mention of the Logos, of the woman of Samaria, of the glorious sixth chapter, of the vine and the branches, of the Upper Room, of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection. These things have changed the face of a large section of humanity, and been the fountainhead from which has flowed a new conception of life. But of all that there is no word. These are not vital, not enlightening, not most

worth reading. There is nothing at all from the Epistles of John or of Peter. There are only some dozen citations from Paul, with one exception quite subsidiary things. And that is all! What sense is there in that?

Even if, in the narrowest way, one accepts the limits set so arbitrarily, and looks only for ethical teachings, there is here no discoverable system of selection to account for the staring gaps, and the unaccountable blanks. Take Buddhism. On what conceivable principle is the Metta Sutta omitted? It is intensely prized by Buddhists, it is taught to their children as the guiding rule for life, it is movingly beautiful, it is very short—two or three lines in all, and yet it is not there. Or the wonderful Parable of the Saw, one of the most notable of moral teachings the world over. Or if Ptah-hotep is included, then why not Santi Deva, whose wonderful little book is one of the most impressive things in human literature, and the record of a moral struggle the intensity of which makes one feel woefully lukewarm and amateurish? Or Huien-Tsiang and his astonishing act of self-dedication on behalf of the bandits about to murder him, one of the surpassing exploits of the human spirit. Or the breath-taking vow of certain of the Mahayana Buddhists, whereby they renounce their Nirvana, and commit themselves to the service of mankind, life after life, till there is not one left among them needing to be saved. Why give us page on page of fifth-rate sayings out of the Mishna, and barely first-class ones from the Gemara, and omit masterpieces such as these?

Or can any one conceive how any mind, wishing to set down the mightiest ethical teachings, could possibly forget the wonderful Judgment scene from the Book of the Dead, that very ancient Egyptian classic; which, old though it be, still towers up, and to the end of time will tower up, one of the loftiest peaks of human genius, a thing staggering in its ethical knowledge and appeal? Yet even that is, not forgotten, but deliberately omitted. For one or two trivial extracts from the Book of the Dead are here.

So it is everywhere. There are fine passages from Confucianism, but there are far finer that ought to be here. And there are deep things from Taoism. But there are deeper still to be had for the taking. And where are the sayings of Muhammad, so human and vivid and moving? Mr. Browne has not used his twenty years to full advantage. He has read widely, but not widely enough. Or else he himself is not the man for this particular enterprise. We are told that his 'The Believing World' 'has been listed by the American Library Association as the most popular book on comparative religion in the libraries of the United States and Canada.' There are better books than this one to be had in the same field, that do not forget the Persian poets, and the Sufis, and Al Ghazzali, and how many more of the great masters here unaccountably despised. Moreover, Mr. Browne is, surely, not a little unguarded in his statements. A man who can calmly declare that 'translations exist of virtually every important holy book. The sacred literature of the entire world can be read to-day in English,' is so incredibly inaccurate that it is difficult not to lose faith in him altogether. There are masses of Mahayana scriptures not yet translated into any European language. And here, again, comes that old, old claim that there is nothing whatever original in the Golden Rule. There are a few parallels to it; in Laotzu for one, in Moti for another. But of the seven witnesses that Mr. Browne summons six testify against him. It is long since Seeley pointed out that Christ had added a new hemisphere to the moral globe, by adding positive to negative morality. And if that is an exaggeration—and it is—it is only the exaggeration of a truth. It is one thing to tell a man, Do not do to others what you would not have them do to you. But to lay upon him as his duty, Do to others what you would that they should do to you—that is a saying from another world. It was Jesus who taught us to spend our lives here for others. In India, to this day, that is no virtue, or, at least, saintliness is not to be won along that road.

But the main impressions left by this book upon the mind are these. First, that here is a hurdle which it will take Barthians all their time to clear. For, blessed be God, He has never left Himself without a witness; and wherever there is a needy spirit, there is He striving to break in to its help. As Seneca said, 'The gods are not jealous; they let down their hands to any one who cares to climb.' And, second, that we have known so long some of the things we ought to do and be! Ptah-hotep is curiously modern, and was, in many ways, as far on as we are now; and yet the world rises so slowly. No doubt humanity is still young, is in its infancy as yet, and must be given time to grow. As Thoreau said, We must be patient. If those to whom we speak do not believe us, their grandchildren may! Perhaps. Yet is even that quite sure? The world seems to keep moving, not so much up, as round and round, returning, time on time, to much the same place as it has often been before. As the shrewd writer of Ecclesiastes, shabbily treated in this volume, saw with a heartsick depression and an unnerving sense of the futility of human effort. Men may say of something, '"Ah! this is new!" but it existed long ago, before our time. From south to north the wind blows round, the wind turns as it blows, turning and then returning on its track.' Mankind has tried so long, and made so little of it, even as the Barthians say. What we need is a Saviour. And, if the world would only believe it, He has come to us in the Lord Jesus Christ.

A. J. GOSSIP.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.